BETWEEN 'REBELLION' AND 'MASSACRE' DISCOURSES: DERSIM 1937-38 IN TURKISH NOVELS

SEREN ÜSTÜNDAĞ

ISTANBUL BİLGİ UNIVERSITY

2015

Istanbul Bilgi University

Institute of Social Sciences

Master of Arts in History

Between 'Rebellion' and 'Massacre' Discourses: Dersim 1937-38 in Turkish Novels.

Thesis submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in History

by Seren Üstündağ

Thesis Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Bülent Bilmez

ISTANBUL BILGI UNIVERSITY

2015

Between 'Massacre' and 'Rebellion' Discourses: Dersim 1937-38 in Turkish Novels

'Katliam' ve 'İsyan' SöylemleriArasında: Türkçe Romanlarda Dersim 1937-38

SerenÜstündağ

111671001

Associate Prof.BülentBilmez (Thesis Advisor):

Prof.NazanAksoy:

Assistant Prof. Başak TuğOnaran:

Approval Date: 24.06.2015

AnahtarKelimeler

1. Dersim 1937-38
2. Tarihyazımı
3. Roman
4. Oryantalizm
5. Türetilmiş Söylem

Keywords

1. Dersim 1937-38
2. Historiography
3. Novel
4. Orientalism
5. Derivative Discourse

An Abstract of SerenÜstündağ's thesis for the degree of Master of Arts at the Bilgi University, Institute of Social Sciences to be taken in June 2015.

Title: Between the 'Rebellion' and 'Massacre' Discourses: Dersim 1937-38 in Turkish Novels

In this thesis, It has observed that Dersim 1937-38 events with the effect of official and alternative historiography rewritten in the novels to give a certain ideological massage to the reader. The degrees of the margin between official history and the novels' discourses have determined the massage of the novel. The description of historical figures, the approach to the Dersim 1937-38 events helped to distinguish those novels position in two certain categories: the oppressor who evaluates the events as 'rebellion' and the oppressed who identify 'massacre'. The handling of theinfluential historical figures, events, such as Seyit Rıza as a figure, or the attacks of Turkish Air Force as an influential act, were formed discursive construction of the novels.With the representing of the liquidation of feudalism, the civilizer mission of the Kemalist regime throughout the reflective characters who symbolize Mustafa Kemal Atatürk himself, the dominant discourse of Dersim 1937-38 novel functioned very well in legislation of massacre in public. The non-canonical novels written with beginning of 1990s, grounding to the alternative historiography and the narrations of the witnesses, identified the Dersim 1937-38 events as massacre and aimed to decelerate that to the public. Although those novels aimed to reveal the truth that the official history and the 'statist' novels has been hiding, the modernization mission , 'self-orientalism', observed in the novels that grounding the witnesses of the Dersim 1937-38 instead of the official history. The common themes of the two groups of novels, which are in fact, just opposite to each other, shows the destructive effect of the of the power which even reach the minds of the oppressed after the physical eradication.

Başlık: 'İsyan' ve 'Katliam' Söylemleri Arasında: Türkçe Romanlarda Dersim 1937-38

Bu tezde, Dersim 1937 38 olaylarının resmi ve alternatif tarih etkisi ile beraber okura belli bir ideolojik mesaj verme amacıyla roman olarak yeniden yazıldığı gözlemlenmiştir. Resmi tarih ile romanın söylemi arasındaki mesafe, romanın mesajını da belirlemiştir. Tarihsel figürlerin betimlenmesi, Dersim 1937-38 yaklaşımları, romanların iki temel kategorideki porsiyonlara ayrılmalarına katkıda bulunmuştur: olayları 'isyan' olarak niteleyen ezenler ve olayları 'katliam' olarak niteleyen ezilenler. Seyit Rıza gibi etkili tarihsel figüreler veya Türk Hava Kuvvetleri'nin etkili saldırıları gibi olayların ele alınışı, romanların söylemsel inşasını oluşturmaktadır. Feodalizmin tasfiyesini, Kemalist rejimin medenileştirme misyonu, Mustafa kemali sembolize eden karakterler üzerinden temsil edilerek, baskın Dersim 1937-38 söylemi kamuda katliamın meşrulaştırma işlevini üstlenir. 1990ların başından itibaren yazılan kanon dışı romanlar ise, alternatif tarih yazımına ve tanıklıklara dayanarak, Dersim 1937-38 olaylarını katliam olarak tanımladı ve bunu kamuyla paylaşmayı amaçladı. Bu romanlar, resmi tarihin ve 'devletçi' romanların gizlemekte olduğutarihi ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamış olsalar da, resmi tarih yerine tanıklıklara dayanan romanlarda da modernizasyonmisyonu, self oryantalizm gözlemlenmiştir. Bu birbirininkarşıtı olan iki gruptaki ortak temalar, iktidarın fiziksel yok edişten sonra ezilenlerin zihnine ulaşarak yarattığı yıkıcı etkiyi göstermektedir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to my advisor Bülent Bilmez for his understanding and patience that was very supportive during the writing process of this thesis. This thesis is possible with his contributions. I thank to Nazan Aksoy and Başak Tuğ Onaran for their interest in my thesis and their criticism, comments and suggestions. With their contributions, my thesis reached its last form. I also would like to thank to Erdem Kabadayı and Sureyya Faruqi who taught the discipline of history to me in their courses.

I want to thank to Jacoob Ahmed who read my thesis line by line and Merjen for editing it. Their suggestions and criticism were also essential for building the last form of this thesis.

I would like to thank to Nihan, Ayşe, Ebru, who were with me during the writing process of this thesis as faithful friends. Also, I want to extend my special thanks to Yener and Gülseren who were there for me whenever I needed them. Especially without Gülseren's support, as a close friend, this process never could be finished.

I owe my deepest gratitude to my family, especially my mother Gülçin Üstündağ, father Ekem Üstündağ, my brother Servet, Sinan and sisters Candan, Özlem Gülcan and Çiğdem; and my uncle Baki Çelebi. They supported and encouraged me in every moment of my life. And, I would like to express my thanks to Apo for his continuous emotional support and patience. His labours, supports were the basic parts of that process although he was far from Turkey.

Lastly, I want to thank to Suphi Nejat Ağırnaslı, from whom I learned a lot and Med Ali Barutçu; who will live in our memories...

TABLE OF CONTENT

CHAPTER I: Introduction.....1

CHAPTER II: Historical Background and Theoretical Framework.....9

2.1.Centralization process of Tanzimat Era 10
2.2.From II. Constitutionalist Period to Koçgiri Rebellion.....18
2.3.Koçgiri Rebellion.....20
2.4.Sheikh Said Rebellion.....23
2.4.1 Laicisim, Alevism and Sheikh Said Rebellion.....28
2.5.Dersim 1937-1938.....34
2.5.1. Dersim1937.....46
2.5.2. Dersim 1938.....50
2.6.Orientalism towards Dersim.....54

CHAPTER III: Dersim Novels: An Overview.....58

3.1. Out of the Dersim novels: An overview of the non-fictional area.....60
3.2. The 'Triangle' Circle: The Focus Novels 85

CHAPTER IV: The Dersim 1937-38 Narrations: The Orientalist and the 'Derivative' Discourses.....87

4.1 The Orientalist Discourse and theLegitimization of the Massacre.....88
4.1.1 *Cemo* by Kemal Bilbaşar.....88
4.1.2 *Memo1* by Kemal Bilbaşar.....107
4.1.3 *Memo 2* by Kemal Bilbaşar.....125
4.1.4 *Dersim 37, Tunceli 38* by Barbaros Baykara.....141
4.1.5 *Kopo* by Mustafa Yeşilova.....156
4.1.6 *Mustafa Kemal'in Kuşları Dersim Yanıyor* by Bilal Civelek.....161
4.2 .The 'Derivative Discourse': The Language Of 'Oppressed'.....164
4.2.1. *Dersimli Memik Ağa* by Haydar Işık.....166
4.2.2. *Arevik* by Haydar Işık.....176
4.2.3. *Gülümse Ey Dersim1* by Munzur Çem.....185
4.2.4. *Gülümse EY Dersim2* by Munzur Çem.....193
4.2.5. *Gülümse Ey Dersim 3* by Munzur Çem.....196
4.2.6. *Umudu ve Tutkusuyla Qopo* by Cafer Demir.....200

CHAPTER IV: CONCLUSION.....203

APPENDIX.....207

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....209

CHAPTER I:

Introduction

One of the most contradictive and traumatic events of the Republican History, Dersim 1937-38 events, have influenced the collective memory of the society in a very significant way. With the centralization and modernization movements of Ottoman state beginning with Tanzimat era, Dersim has been marginalized because of its heterodox ethnic, religious and linguistic structure. From that time, like the rest of the Ottoman domain, Dersim encountered the intervention of the state.

Seeking solution to "Dersim Issue," in fact, many reports were prepared by governmental officials in the Ottoman period. Yet, the Ottoman state did not have control of the region and, Dersim remained unconquered. On the contrary to Ottoman period, having the knowledge of the "Dersim Issue," with the promulgation of the republic, the government aimed to have the entire power/control in the region. The problem and its solutions, in other words, transferred to the new regime. The way that Ottoman state draw to cope with the issue, was initial sources of the Republican state about Dersim. The gradual approach that the Ottoman governors suggested above, which consisted of disciplining and assimilation, also became the course of action of the new regime.[1]

As a matter of fact, after promulgation of the Republic, the government, as a part of centralization and modernization movement, evaluated the "Dersim Issue" in a more decisive way. The breaking point developed by the Sheikh Said rebellion in 1925, and the self – confidence gained with the suppression of the rebellion, also influenced the evaluation of Dersim issue by the state.

[1] Gündoğdu, Cihangir ve Vural Genç. 2013. *Dersim'de Osmanlı Siyaseti*. İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi. Pg 41.

In 1935, Tunceli Law was passed as a crucial concrete step in one hand, while on the other hand, with the construction of bridges, roads, barracks, governmental building as power instruments, the state accelerated the process. With the *tedbil* and *tenkil* politics of the state with multi-dimensioned process was started. After the foundation of the instruments of the cultural transformation/assimilation in the region, the military manoeuvre which resulted in the execution of Seyit Rıza and some powerful tribe leaders, including civil casualties, especially because of the destructive effects of Turkish Air Force, started in the spring of 1937. In 1938, on the other hand, the "reclamation" of the region was operated entirely. That reclamation which was in fact disciplining and punishing, turned in to an eradication of the entire existence of the region, which included killing women and children. While, the process of 1937-38, was decelerating to the public as a civilization movement and discharging of the feudalism in the region, the "wildness" of "rebels" was framed in the dominated state discourse on the Dersim movement.[2]

Therefore, one of the historical events, which is a "red line" of the Turkish Republic's past, Dersim 1937-1938, has become a sphere for both the official and the alternative readings of Republic historiography. From the first reports about the reclamation of Dersim, to the *Sel Hareketi* 1937-1938 the state constructed an orientalist discourse, which functioned for the realization of two targets: having the entire control of the region and creating its own orient.

Firstly, beginning with Tanzimat period, modernization process started to intervene with the public life and to centralize the power. Dersim in its "uncanny" position, therefore, gradually gained a key place to constitute that aim. With the foundation of Republic, this position of Dersim became more crucial because of its ethnic/religious and denominational nature. Attempts of Ottoman state, in other word, to discipline Dersim, went further after the Republic formed. The discontentedness of Kurds, and as a result of rebellions around

[2] Baran, Taha. 2014. Basında Dersim. İstanbul: iletişim. Pg. 103-104.

Kurdistan, especially Sheikh Said rebellion in 1925, became a legitimization area for the "Doğu Planı" (Eastern Plan) of the state, which recommended assimilation and eradication.

The second base of the discourse on Dersim, was a creation from "east," which fulfilled the modernism desire of Turkish Republic[3]. The civilized, educated modern Turkish Republic, by using exactly opposite adjectives of itself for Dersim, aimed to legitimate its acts through "civilization" of Dersim. The uprisings of Dersim tribes against both the Ottoman and the Republican states, therefore, strengthened the state's arguments.[4] The reclamation plan of East, in fact was stated with a metaphor: Dersim was a "boil" and should be eradicated from the body of the Turkish Republic.

That metaphor found its reflections in the Republican novel. The "survival" of the Dersim, and its transformation to Tunceli, became an influential theme to deal with the social problems of the country such as class struggle, degeneration of governors and the function of intellectuals in the country. Dersim massacre, therefore, with the discursive construction of the state as mentioned above, started to represent the transformation of "ignorant" and "pure" Anatolian people who have been manipulated "for centuries" by the spiritual leadership, into intellectual/Kemalist citizens of a fictional sphere. Yet, the fictional universe, besides that discourse, became an area of the writers that construct different narration of Dersim 1937-38 history in an exactly opposite manner. With the rising of Kurdish Movement in 1990s, the novels, which target both the official discourse on Dersim and the novels written under that "statist" frame were written by Dersimi writers[5]. 1937-1938 events, in other words, written

---

[3]Makdisi, Ussama. "Ottoman orientalism." *The American Historical Review* 107.3 (2002): 768-796. Pg 768.

[4]Zeydanlıoğlu, Welat. "Beyaz Türk'ün Yükü": Oryantalizm, Kemalizm ve Türkiye'de Kürtler *Toplum ve Kuram*, Sayı: 2, Güz 2009, sayfa. 195-211. Pg 201.

[5] With the rise of Kurdish movement, in other words, it begin to write its own historigraphy about 'Kurdish Alevis' grounding the supportive base among this ethnic/religious group. (Gezik, Erdal. 2011. Alevi Kürtler. İstanbul: İletişim, pg 22)

either by historians or by novelists as a discursive area, were used very often in order to convey a certain massage from a certain point of view. In my thesis I analyse opposite narrative constructions of Dersim 1937-38 in the fictional area, specifically in the novels which focus the Dersim 1937-38. By comparing both official and alternative historiography to the "history" in the novels I distinguish "fiction in reality" from "reality in fiction" throughout the Dersim 1937-1938 narrations in novels.

In this context, the aim of this thesis is to explore the different discourses of the Dersim 1937-38 events. By focusing the novels written about that events which are constructed in different aspects but with similar themes, I shed light on how novels became a discursive area of orientalist attitude of the state towards Dersim in order for it to legitimate its "civilization" mission. Also, by looking at the novels written by the writers who are from Dersim, I follow discursive traces of the orientalist discourse in self-orientalism form and in civilization argument in terms of Kurdish nationalism. I used the concept of "Orientalism" to explain the attitude of the state and the statist novels. For the Dersimi writers' novels, I prefer to use "derivative discourse," which Partha Chatterjee suggests for the discursive construction of "colonized" side for struggling with the colonizer.

At this point some questions occur in terms of the sources: Is it possible to reach a result through the fiction in order to analyse a historical event? Can novel be a source for that study? Should the focus, on the other hand, be the only text or the external effects on the text taken to consideration such as authorial background, the publishing house, the political identity/the ideological position of both? Although those question have their own studies that are not possible to be included because of the extent of this study, I answer them in the frame of this thesis in the following pages.

The history and the novel seem to have a fatal nuance: one is claimed to write the truth and the other one to create/fictionalise it. Yet, John Tosh indicates that the history both states

the events that happened in the past, the reconstruction and transforming of past in the studies of historians.[6] This definition evaluates the function of history and implies that the difference between history and novel as a fiction is not so certain and definite. Although the novel as a genre of fiction is supposed to be a sphere where reality is suspended on the contrary to history; yet, a historian as "producers" of stories through narration of historical study is an "author" just like a novelist. Tosh also states that the function of the history is to lead people according to a certain point of view. Therefore, building of the past, like historical works/texts/narrations, is one of the major topics of novels in addition to other fictional functions of the novels. Constructing a common historical awareness, historiography has also a certain narration, which one can identify as a fiction.[7] According to Linda Hutchehon the common ground of history and novels is language. Both history and novels construct their narration upon language that brings a linguistic reality instead of an objective one.[8] Also, both history and novel feed with the other narrations written before this also prevents the claims of originality or trueness.

Therefore, the novel as an area of the fictionalization of social, cultural, historical "realities," can be read as a historiographic text which is more fictional than an academic study about a historical event. Due to the fact that both historians and novelists use "description," "narration" and "analysis" in their works, the authorial background is important in both areas.[9] Yet, although in the case of historians it seems to not be of a concern, for novelists the authorial background is considered to be a vital aspect. Stemming from that, the socio-cultural background, the ideological position of the novelist, for example, is regarded as a crucial part of analysing the novel. Yet in this study the novels are handled as a part of

---

[6]Tosh, John. 2013. *Tarihin Peşinde*. Çev. Özden Arıkan. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları. Pg 3.
[7] İbid. 4-5.
[8] Hutchehon,Linda. 1990. *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*. New York and London: Routledge. Pg 105.

[9] Tosh, 2013. Pg 111.

historiography on Dersim 1937-38. Therefore, I focus on the Dersim 1937-38 events and compare the discourses of two opposite Dersim 1937-38 narrations in regard to the official/alternative historiography of the Dersim 1937-38. Although there is also a chapter handling a general overview on Dersim novels and the writers, as the focus of the thesis, the narration itself is evaluated. Namely, exploring the similarities in terms of discursive constructions/themes of opposite narrations, and their intertextual relations is the focus of this study.

Dersim 1937-38 for a long time period was decelerated as the "victory" of Turkish Republic against the inner enemies/feudal lords. On the other hand, the same event was identified as a massacre, kept as a secret and talked only with a muted voice by the witnesses.[10] The historiography proceeded the discourse of the state and in fact, helped to legitimate the 1937-38. In the novels, on the other hand, it is possible to observe the influence of those two opposite dimensions that are actually constructed/written from a certain point of view. Although all of the novels written on 1937-38 cannot sharply put on one of those sides, almost all of them more or less can be added to this categorization.[11]

In other words, one of them aimed to create a fictional history in order to legitimate the act of the state, give a massage to the audience about the power of the state/the necessity of the Dersim movement, while the other group, tried to rewrite the history in order to show the "real history," which was hidden by the state. Not surprisingly, both sides claim to write the "right" history. Therefore, arguably, the novels written on Dersim 37-38 events can be counted as a part of the historiography on Dersim 1937-38.

---

[10]Bülmez, Bülent. "Sözlü Tarih ve Belgesel Film Aracılığıyla Bir Kıyımla Yüzleşmek ve Hesaplaşmak" in Özgür Fındık. 2012. *Kara Vagon.* İstanbul: Fam pg. 10.

[11] The different perception of Dersim 1938 in the historiography which Bilmez indicate, is valid in the context of the novels either. As a matter of fact, the focus novels of this study have more definite sides as 'statist' and 'opponents' which construct a modernization perception either for Turks or Kurds. Yet, there are other novels which objects what state done in 1937-38 but also not take the side of the writers who imagine a Kurdish national identity instead of a Turkish one. (ibid, 10-11)

The official approach to Dersim forms the first layer of the discourse on the Dersim 1937-38 novels. Novels that support and produce that official approach in a "literal" aspect becomes the second layer. On the other hand, the novels written by Dersimi authors who grounding on the witnesses aim to rewrite the history of Dersim 1937-38 along with the alternative historiography accumulated in time become the third layer of that discursive framework. Therefore, this three layered triangle of texts, the official history, the alternative historiography, the "statist" and the "opponent" novels feed each other. Aiming to impose the "truth," the statist novels became a legitimization area of Dersim movement and proved the necessity for modernization. The novels of "opponent" that were generally written by Dersimi authors who built their novels upon refutation of those claims in the statist novels about Dersim 1937-38 and their own modernization perspective against the Turkish modernization.

In my study, firstly I focus on novels written by Kemal Bilbaşar, Barbaros Baykara, Mustafa Yeşilova and Bilal Civelek on Dersim 1937-38 events which reproduce the state's official discourse on Dersim in an orientalist way. Then, as my another focus, I evaluate novels of Haydar Işık, Munzur Çem and Cafer Demir which aim to refute both official historiography and the novels of the writers mentioned above, which legitimize Dersim massacre with an orientalist discourse. This study focuses on the text/the narration itself instead of focusing on the time period. As a matter of fact, certain narrations on the Dersim 1937-38 from Kemal Bilbaşar's novel *Cemo* which was published in 1966 to the Haydar Işık's novel Arevik, published in 2013, are chosen for the study. The frame of the study is limited, considering of a great number of novels written on the issue and also the theoretical frame which is pointed below. In other words, the choosing of primary sources of this study is shaped in the frame of binary opposition in the discourse on Dersim 1937-38 which is "rebellion" and "massacre." The determining power of words brings other results. For

example, all novels in this study indicating Dersim 1937-38 events as "massacre" and are written by Dersimi writers.

In the second chapter, the historical background and the theoretical frame framework is evaluated throughout the historiography of Dersim 1937-38. Following the Dersim issue from the Tanzimat era to the promulgation of the republic, the processes and the policies will be analysed until 1935 Tunceli Law. With its focus on the 1937-38 process itself, the theoretical ground of the study is evaluated in between conceptualizing "orientalism" and the "derivative discourse" throughout the secondary sources. In the third chapter, an overview of the novels focusing Dersim 1937-38 will be given with the non-text information, such as prologues, epilogues, which gives some clues about the position of the "authorial eye."

In the fourth chapter, the primary sources are divined to major parts and throughout passages focused novels are analysed and put in to the theoretical framework. The discursive relations of the novels and their interactions with historiography are handled. The intertextualities in the novels and the discursive construction of each novel are compared to each other and the historiography. First, in the first part of the chapter, the novels of Kemal Bilbaşar *Cemo*, *Memo 1* and *Memo2*, Barbaros Baykara' novel *Dersim 1937*, *Tunceli 1938*, Mustafa Yeşilova's *Kopo* and Bilal Civelek's novel *Mustafa Kemal'in Kuşları Dersim Yanıyor* are the focus in terms of their discourses on Dersim 1937-38 massacre, the characterization upon the real figures of the Dersim 1937-38, while interactions between them is analysed. In the second part of the chapter, after finding out the construction of the "statist" novel, Haydar Işık's *Dersimli Memik Ağa, Arevik,* Munzur Çem's *Gülümse Ey Dersim 1-2-3* and Cafer Demir's *Umudu Ve Tutkusuyla Qopo* novels are analysed with a comparison to the "statist" novel. The theoretical context of the novels, will focused with following question: How do those novels construct their discourses? What is the relationship between official/alternative historiography and those novels in terms of evaluating Dersim 1937-38?

What kind of intention do the novels aim to convey to the reader? Even if they seem to be on exactly opposite sides, do they have any common arguments/discourses on Dersim or Dersimis? In this chapter, the answer for these question is humbly answered through the close reading of the novels.

Having novel as a main source, it is possible to see how the state constructs its ideology/its historical discourse throughout the novel. And also, in the context of Dersim novels, there is also the possibility of seeing the language of the "oppressed," that has been muted right after the massacre and even today is trying to find a space to realize the confrontation with the Dersim 1937-38. Yet, during this desire to explain the "truth" of Dersim by defining it as massacre, the novels show the influence of the dominant discourse on the "oppressed" language, which also makes the novel a very useful primary source to observe that discourse derived from the dominant/official discourse.

CHAPTERII:

The Historical Background and the Theoretical Framework

After explaining the modernization process of the Ottoman Empire and the emergence of centralization policies in late Ottoman period this chapter discusses certain approaches (literature review) to the Dersim region. These approaches are separated two main ideas that state policies and the challenging the official history.

It is necessary to provide an account of social and religious structures of Dersim from the Ottoman Empire period to the Republican era in order to understand how novel writing on Dersim was shaped.

Centralization process of Tanzimat Era

Due to Alevism[12] for more than a century the cultural identity, ethnic and religious structures of Dersim have been perceived as heterodox, marginal and were attempted to be changed by the state administrators of both the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic.[13]

The turning point in the relationship of Dersim to the state after the Tanzimat era, can be explained by Foucault's approach on transformation of the relationship between the state as a power and the public.[14] According to Foucault, in the beginning of the eighteenth century power introduces itself as an organizer and transformer, and as a result, it imposes a subjectivity on individuals. The subjectivity in this frame, does not refer to freedom, but rather with the 'truth law', the power directly intervenes to the daily lives of the people. The subjection of an individual to the power is accepted as the "nature' of the relationship between governors and those who are governed, and is also taken as the condition of a "modern" power. The modernization and centralization process of the Ottoman state along with its relationship with Dersim as a part of public can be considered as that framework., With the Tanzimat ruling the state for the first time began to be 'visible' in the public's daily life in order to coordinate the 'invisible' modern power among its domains.[15]

Through centralization policies, which began with the Tanzimat era, the Ottoman state aimed to integrate its distant provinces into the central administration. The Tanzimat state not only aimed to establish a central and uniform system of administration, taxation, military recruitment and justice, but also aimed to break the influence of local power holders. That is, the Ottoman central administration through several reforms aimed to transform its indirect rule into a direct rule which leads to its future intervention into people's daily life. Dersim,

---

[12] Alevism as a religious system still has lots of debates on it. In this thesis it refers to Dersim Alevis who is introduced as a heterodox religious group that is Kurdish/Zaza by Brunessen and Çağaptay. Brunessen, Martin Van. 2000 *Kürtlük Türklük Alevilik*. Çev. Hakan Yurdakul. İstanbul İletişim, Çağaptay, Soner.2009. *Türkiye'de İslam, Laiklik ve Milliyetçilik: Türk Kimdir?* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları,

[13] Arslan, Şükrü. 2010. *Herkesin Bildiği Sır: Dersim*. İstanbul: İletişim.

[14] Foucault, Michel. 2011Özne ve İktidar, Çev. Işık Ergüder ve Osman Akınhay. İstanbul: Ayrıntı, Pg 63.

[15] Michel, Foucault. 2010. The Birth Of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France 1978-1979. New York: Palgrave Macmillian, Pg 77.

located at the eastern margins of the Empire, was also influenced by the centralization and modernization policies of the Tanzimat era."Claiming Dersim", emerged in that context as a reflection of modernization and centralization movements of the Ottoman Empire.[16] Dersim, as an 'unconquered region', had remained free from imposed taxes and military services. Therefore, Dersim's autonomous position caught the attention of Ottoman reformist and centralist bureaucrats.

The breaking point of the state, the "imagination community" of the Ottoman state started with The Rescript of Gülhane by defining citizenship.[17] Provisions of the rescript were a modernization movement, which was based on equality among Muslims and non-Muslims. More significantly, they created auto-limitations to the power of the state that completely had belonged to a sultan before the rescript. . It was obvious that during the Tanzimat period, there were non-Muslims in the vision of the state, and the imagination of "citizenship" was more heterogenic.

Following the 1877-1878 Ottoman-Russia War, which lead the loss of Balkan territories, and thus, non-Muslim citizens, the state started to emphasize more and more strongly its Islamic identity. State's emphasis on Sunnism become an ideological notion, and therefore the state started to rethink its own multi religious structure.

As a matter of fact, later, the Hamidian Regime, clearly argued that the Ottoman Sultan was the caliph of all the Muslims. This was a "modern" usage of religion which drew citizenship in a very "modern" way.[18] Such an emphasis on Islamic identity, and its promotion by the central state excluded non-Muslims and non-Sunni Muslims from political and social domains.

---

[16] Cihangir Gündoğdu ve Vural Genç. *Dersim'de Osmanlı Siyaseti*. İstanbul: Kitapyayınevi, 2013. Pg 13
[17] Anderson, Benedict. *Immagined Communities*. For further: Allison, Christina. Yezidiler.
[18] Deringil, Selim. 1998. *Well Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876-1909.* London: IB Tauris, Pg 54-55.

During the Tanzimat era, the main target of the state was to establish its direct rule in these (the mountains, deserts and distant agricultural lands) regions either by negotiating with or applying physical coercion against the local power groups.[19] However, because of the financial burden and especially the geographical restriction, there were limits to integration of Dersim into the Ottoman center. Knowing the difficulty of establishing a direct rule, the Ottoman central administration organized several punitive expeditions to the region in order to keep it under control. This did not mean that the inhabitants of Dersim were silent to state policies: several local uprisings similar to the Koçgiri Rebellion of 1851 erupted throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Moreover, military operations did not bring a permanent state presence until 1875, and the state never reached the *Cebeli Dersim* (the domestic/inner Dersim). Having become aware of its limitations, the Ottoman state either by persuasion or bribing forced the tribal and religious leaders to integrate the state authority and maintain the central rule over the region. On the other hand, the state maintained the development of instruments that could bring its authority into Dersim, such as roads, barracks and government buildings.

In the late Ottoman Period, as an administrative unit, Dersim was a broad region which was technically autonomous. The autonomy of Dersim with its distinct cultural and social structures was generally regarded as 'feudal' in the secondary literature dealing with Dersim's Ottoman past. As will be shown, the depiction of the ruling segments like *agha,sheikh* and *begs* and religious groups like *rayber,seyits* in the secondary literature is highly problematical. This structure of Dersim was not perceived as an issue until the late Ottoman period when the policies of modernization and centralization appeared.

[19] Koç, Yener. Bedirxan Pashazades Power Relations and Nationalism (1876-1914). MA thesis. Boğaziçi Unversity, 2012.

In that context, Dersim with its heterodox identity was regarded as a threat to the Islamic unity and Islamic identity, which was had been envisioned and constructed during the Hamidian period. The construction of a modern, centralized and Sunni state in order to "protect" the empire required a homogeneity or at least disciplining of the "heterodox" groups such as Qızılbash or Yezidis[20]. Therefore, the process which started with the Hamidian era became a breaking point for Dersim up until now when the central state threatens not only Dersim's religious structure, but also its social and political structures.

Because of the tough and "wild" conditions of its terrain the Dersim region had always remained as part of the periphery of the Ottoman state center, and was never conquered at all[21]. This fate of Dersim began to change dramatically in the mid nineteenth century, which was a breaking point all over the domains, and proceeded after the foundation of the Turkish Republic.[22]

With the modernization process, the changing atmosphere of the state affected its domains in very practical ways, due to the fact that the state was very careful about non-Muslims and the other contrarian groups. After the 1878 Berlin Treatment, the relationship/closeness between the Armenians and Dersim Qızılbash, for example, agitated the Ottoman state. The Dersim region was the sphere of interaction between Armenians and Alevi people who were perceived as uncanny by the state. As a result, the state wanted to keep them under its surveillance. Therefore, the interaction between these two "suspicious" groups reached a new juncture. The state, was incrementally becoming Sunni and that started to bring some consequences to the Alevis in Dersim.

---

[20] Yezidisis a Kurdish-speaking syncretic religious group.

[21] Akpınar, Alişan ve Sezen Bilir, serhat Bozkurt ve Namık Kemal Dinç, "II. Abdulhamid dönemi raporlarında 'Dersim Sorunu' ve Zihinsel Devamlılık."In Herkesin Bildiği Sır: Dersim. Şükrü Arslan.

[22] Akyürekli, Mahmut. Dersim Kürt Tedibi. İstanbul: Kitap yayınevi, pg 41-43.

The eyes of the state were following the developments in the region, and the state began to take measures against the region and the entities that caused suspicion. Because of the failure of the military movements until the Hamidian Period, Abdulhamid II, brought a new policy which aimed to keep order in the region through assimilation and civilization. Therefore, the whole dynamics of the region was highly important for the state.

The secret code dated 15 May 1893, which came from the *Dördüncü Ordu Müşirliği* (Fourth Army Marshall) spoke about the prevention of the intimate relationship between Armenians and Dersim.[23] As a "potential rebel" Dersim was already in a suspicious position and its relationship with the Armenians made the government even more sensitive to the situation. In 1895, in order to keep the region under control and discipline in terms of all the facts mentioned above, Ahmed Şakir Pasha was given exceptional powers by being appointed as region's Anadolu *Vilâyât-ı Umûm Müfettişliği*[24].

Abdulhamid II's most important attempt regarding the region was sending Zeki Pasha—a founder of the *Hamidiye Alayları* (Hamidiye Regiment)—to Dersim in order to prepare a report, which suggested the "reclamation" of the region. The report presented ideas and claims that were considered even in the Republican period such was the preparation of the details in 1896.[25] The *Anadolu Umum Müfettişi* (General Inspector of Anatolia)Şakir Pasha's report, which was prepared in 1899, suggested to gain the obedience of Dersim via a "gradual approach" to the region. The gradual approach obviously consisted of some precautions and acts firstly regarding the military surrounding, secondly regarding the construction of roads in order to make a better contact with the people of Dersim and finally regarding an attempt of transforming the culture of the region from Alevism to Sunnism.

---

[23] Cihangir Gündoğdu ve Vural Genç. *Dersim'de Osmanlı Siyaseti*. İstanbul: Kitap yayınevi, 2013. Pg 31
[24] Karaca, Ali. 1993. *Anadolu Islahatı ve Ahmed Şakir Paşa. (1838-1899)* İstanbul: Eren.
[25] Akyürekli, (2011) Pg 45.

The third report which was sent to the state in 1903 by Mardini Arif Bey emphasized the necessity of collecting guns from the Dersim and recommended exile as a course of action against the deserters[26]. Mardini Arif Bey considered the people of Dersim as 'slaves' of the local powers such as Seyit, *Dede*s and aghas. According to Arif Bey, the spiritual leaders were the manipulators of the religion, and the others were *eşkiya* (brigandage) and *fesat* (malice). The next reports were sent to the state by Mutasarrıf Celal Bey from 1903 to 1906. Mutasarrıf Celal Bey also recommended the exile of the tribal leaders, though which he, aimed to break the local powers.

The last report which was prepared by a commission with the leadership of Ali Pasha, reiterated same suggestions: some military reinforcement, disciplining the local governors and the "transformation" steps that were determined in the previous reports. It is possible to observe that the suggestion of the reports did not have a discourse similar that of the Republican period, which basically advocated for 'eradication'[27], rather than discipline and punishment of Dersim in order to keep it controlled.

Although the state in those reports did not indicate directly removing people, the controlling involves not only "bringing peace" but also bringing transformation to the region. How the religious difference of Dersim was perceived by the state became manifested by the recommendation of sending members of Nakşibendicult, which was a conservative Sunni one, to intervene the social structure of Dersim. Accordingly it is possible to lay stress that assimilation and suppression were the two basic notions of these reports[28]. For this reason, the region was considered by the state as wild, "deviant", rebellious and in need for "civilization".

---

[26] Aygün, Hüseyin.2009. *Dersim 1938 ve Zorunlu İskan*. Ankara: Dipnot. Pg58-63.

[27] Mülkiye Müfettişi (The civil inspector) in his report dated 1926, depicts Dersim as an 'boil' against the Republican government. The original expression is as following: " Dersim cumhuriyet hükümeti için bir çıbandır. Akpınar, Alişan, Sezen Bilir, Serhat Bozkurt, Namık Kemal Dinç. "II. Abdulhamid Dönemi Raporlarında 'Dersim Sorunu' ve Zihinsel Devamlılık" in edit. Şükrü Arslan. 2011. *Herkesin Bildiği Sır.* İstanbul: İletişim. Pg311-320.

[28] B.O.A.Y. EE, 81-8 H1310CA. O2

Some scholars such as Suat Akgül and Mahmut Akyürekli in their works blame the local system of Dersim which was presented as feudal and according to them was "autonomic for over three hundred years". In addition to that, Akgül and Akyürekli also accuse the individual interest groups that consisted of the *kaymakam* or governmental officers and state bureaucracy for the 'Dersim issue'. Dersim According to Akgül and Akyürekli[29] because of the religious and tribal leaders of Dersim it was never restrained, and due to this fact, the "question of Dersim" was carried over to the Republic period. In the long term, the implication of the approach can be counted as a legitimization tactic of 1937-1938 which occurred under the control of the young, "modern" Republic.

Akyürekli points out that there was a power struggle between new system of the state which begun to build from the First Constitutionalist period and the local leaders who were encountering losing their powers. This threatening process discomforted the *aghas, begs* and *dedes*. The new system both impinged their power and sovereignty as well as disciplined them. The tax, military service, construction of roads, bridges were all instruments of the state with which the Dersim region was surrounded step by step. Although Akyürekli accepts the state's actions as "interventional", he also regards these attitudes as a necessity. "Without knowing all these progressions, busy with the daily routine, the unaware people had only information about the developments in their country and the world, just as much as the *aghas* and *dedes* let them know," says Akyürekli.[30] He refuses the subjectivity of the public and envisions them as 'ignorant' people who were herded/deceived by these local powers.

[29] Akyürekli, 2011. Pg 46. The original text is as following: "Ağa ve dede koalisyonları, bu toprakları üç yüz yılı aşkın bir süre özerk bölgeler oluşturup derebeylik mantığıyla yönettiler ve halkı Osmanlı idaresinden uzak tuttular. Bütün zülüm politikalarına rağmen Osmanlı devleti, bölgede bir Kızılbaş sorunu yaşamamak adına olaylara göz yumdu".

[30] İbid, 43. The original text is as following: "Bu gelişmelerden habersiz, günlük yaşamın sorunları ile meşgul, sindirilmiş halkın, ülkesindeki dünyadaki gelişmelerden ağaların ve dedelerin istediği kadarını öğrenme hakkı vardı."

According to Akyürekli they were an "unconscious mass" and the leaders were the individuals to decide this mass' fate.

This perception of being dangerous is also mentioned by Zafer Toprak, which according to him, stemmed from the 'feudality' of Dersim.[31] Toprak points that before 1937-1938, the leader of tribes predominated Dersim. Toprak indicates that the leaders were moving around in both their own, and the other tribes were exploiting the community and were hunting a religious/spiritual leader and taking a *fatwa* from them in order to legitimize all their illicit acts. Also, Toprak adds that these leaders had reliable armed men from their own tribes to extort animals and property from the unarmed poor villages and plunder the village. According to Toprak, until 1937-1938 there was an *asayiş suçu* (public order crime) in Dersim because of the local powers. Therefore, an intervention would be a solution for this question. However, these approaches brought ignorance of the fact that the region was not a "natural" part of the Ottoman Empire or Turkish Republic. Each maneuver principally was an attempt to conquer the region.

As a matter of fact, in the light of that context, the conceptualization of Beşikçi which describes Dersim movements as a "colonization" process becomes more meaningful.[32] Although Toprak and Akyürekli assert that the tribal system of the Dersim was built over a cruel, wild or primitive structure, there are some other studies that suggest the opposite. Cihangir Gündoğdu and Vural Genç[33], clarify that based on the *layihas*, the people of Dersim were immagined as subservient, fulfilled their military and taxation obligations, had great respect for the Sultan and Caliph and were also supposed to be Hanafi[34].In other words, what made Dersim problematic was not actually the inner dynamics of the region but the prospect

[31]Toprak, Zafer. "Sunuş" in Tuba Ekmekçi ve Muazzez Pervan. *Dersim Harekatı ve Cumhuriyet Bürokrasisi*(1936-190). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları. Pg 15.
[32] Beşiki, İsmail. *Tunceli Kanunu (1935) ve Dersim Jenosidi*. İstanbul: Belge Yayınları, 1990.
[33]Cihangir Gündoğdu ve Vural Genç. 2013. *Dersim'de Osmanlı Siyaseti*. İstanbul: Kitapyayınevi, Pg 18-19.
[34] The major sect of islam which Ottoman Empire also begun to percieve as offical sect with Hamidian Regime. Deringil, Selim. 2007. *Simgeden Millete*. İstanbul: İletişim. pg 29.

of the state itself. That is, the residents of Dersim as a group with an identity were fantasized-/fictionalized by the state as functional citizens. Consequently, the military and civil bureaucrats were in charge to provide the transformation to turn this fantasy about Dersim into reality.

From II. Constitutionalist Period to Koçgiri Rebellion

The alteration and regulation of Dersim by military maneuvers continued while the sociocultural preventions were proceeding. In 1907 by command of Naşit Pasha a military movement began against Dersim. The 1907 maneuvers, according to Akyürekli, failed and remained incomplete because of the promulgation of the Second Constitutional Period. Due to this fact, the *Harbiye Nezareti (*Ministry of War) ordered to finish the maneuver without drawing blood via the agreement with the tribal leaders[35]. The last military activity of the Ottoman Empire for 'civilization' of Dersim was in 1909 under the leadership of İbrahim Pasha.

The position of Armenians was recognized by the state as a threat due to the Ottoman-Russian War, and the changing citizenship profile displayed Christians as "foreigners" in the domains of the empire. Turkification of Anatolia resulted in the Armenian Massacre. Dersim, which was also a 'suspicious' region because of its religious, ethnic and social structures, had a close relationship with the Armenians.[36] During the Armenian Massacre of 1915-1916 some tribes in Dersim helped the Armenians, while others such as Pülümür (Kuzican) and Kiğı tribes kept loyal to the state. Although there were a few tribes which were loyal to the state, it is safe to conclude that there was a significant level of solidarity between Dersim and Armenians during 1915-1916.

[35] Akyürekli, 2011. pg 46-47
[36] İbid, 48.

Even because of such "abundance", Armenian historiography implicates the Armenian roots of the Dersimis as part of an Armenian national discourse. Also, according to the Turkish official history that relationship appeared as an implication of the origins of the Alevis. As a suspicious group the Alevis were still perceived as a threat. Therefore, that approach, because of that close relationship, blamed Dersimis for being also "Armenian".[37]

During the relocations of Armenians, there was propaganda against the state as the following: "The Kurds will be killed after the Armenians".[38] Although the official history, regards that as "agitation" or "separatism speech" from the "rebels" of the Armenians, who were finally cleaned/sent out of the domains[39], in the Republican period in 1937-1938, some Dersim people thought that the Armenians were right.[40] Brunessen's association of Kurdish nationalism with the Armenian Genocide shows the level of the Armenian Genocide trauma over the Kurds even though they were also responsible for the massacre.[41]

After the Armenian Genocide, in 1917 Seyit Rıza and the Western and Eastern Dersim tribes went to war together with the Ottoman state against Russia. That war resulted in the recession of Russia and became a significant event that was supposed to provide a gun stock to the people of Dersim. The discourse of the state on Dersimis becoming "dangerous" was supported with their gun ownership after that war. Additionally, official history indicates that by means of "swaging" the remaining Armenians and tribal leaders became substantially wealthy. By courtesy of the Russia War, which was the Dersim tribes also fought, the state

---

[37] Aksoy, Gürdal. 2012. Dersim Alevilik, Ermenilik, Kürtlük. İstanbul: Dipnot. Pg 51.

[38] Massicard, Elise. The Repression of the Koçgiri Rebellion, 1920-1921. Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence. http://www.massviolence.org/The-Repression-of-the-Kocgiri-Rebellion-1920-1921 (17.01.2015)" Also there is an idea that Nurettin paşa said that they killed the people who said zo, and they will kill the people who said lo." Look, Ayşe Hür (10.03.2013) Radilkal (Daily newspaper) *Sene 1921: Koçgiri İsyanı, Alişer ve Zarife.*

[39] Some novels written by authors from Dersim such as Haydar Işık, Munzur Çem, Remzi Aydın, etc. emphasize that and from a point of view of mysticism some of them think that Dersim massacre was a response to their betrayal to Armenians.

[40] Remzi Aydın's novel named *Torpak Dile Geldi* and Haydar ışık's novel *Arevik* focuses on that situation. Remzi Aydın. *Toprak Dile Geldi Xârde u Korê.* İstanbul: Kibele, 2011. Haydar Işık. Arevik. Ankara: Satırarası, 2013.

[41] Brunessen, Martin van. 2003. *Ağa, Şeyh ve Devlet.* İstanbul: İletişim, pg 393

found another reason for the movements and legitimation area of the movements to Dersim. In the time period called "national struggle" or "independence war", with the heritage of the Ottoman state, the *İttihak ve Terakki Cemiyeti* (Committee of Union and Progress), after eliminating the Armenians, begun to deal with the Kurdish issue which also captured the Dersim issue. Both Turkishness and Sunnism, excluded Dersim and that meant that Dersim would also be a great issue for the new born Republic.

Koçgiri Rebellion

Ellise Masssicard spoke about the difference of Koçgiri, "In this framework, Koçgiri is given special significance because it is widely considered as the first expressly Kurdish nationalist rebellion in the emerging Turkish Republic."[42]Also, according to Abdurrahman Arslan, the Koçgiri rebellion was the first reflection of the colonization of Kurdistan.[43] At the same time, the rebellion is evaluated in official history as a public order crime or enact of secessionists, who were thought to want to divide the country with the "aid and abet" of the British. According to Akyürekli, it was the local powers effort to keep their powers over the "poor" Dersim people.[44] Nuri Dersimi describes Koçgiri as an 'independency war'.

It is depicted by Zafer Toprak as 'power struggle' between Nuri Dersimi and Mustafa Kemal.[45] That struggle according to Toprak, became an issue after the Sevres Treaty that "gave credit to" political constructions such as Armenia and Kurdistan. Toprak adds that because Ankara had a "state tradition" coming from past and Mustafa Kemal was a "military and political genius" Mustafa Kemal won that struggle. Also, the Kemalist oriented writers

---

[42] Massicard, Elise. The Repression of the Koçgiri Rebellion, 1920-1921. Online Encyclopaedia of Mass Violence. http://www.massviolence.org/The-Repression-of-the-Kocgiri-Rebellion-1920-1921 (17.01.2015) pg 14.
[43] Arslan, Abdurrahman.
[44] Akyürekli, 2011. Pg 49-50.
[45]Toprak, Zafer. 2011. "Sunuş" in Tuğba Ekmekçi*Kürt Sorunu ve Devlet Tedip ve Tenkil Politikaları (1925-1947),*İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

such as Baki Öz attribute Turkishness to the Koçgiri tribes and imagine the rebellion to be "set" by Sunni Kurds, who were feudal and "naturally" responsible for the rebellion.[46]

The process that Koçgiri occurred under very complicated atmosphere, which placed Koçgiri in the middle of the whole discussion of the future of Turks, Kurds, Alevis and Sunnis. The "independence war," which was driven by Mustafa Kemal, did not capture all of the remaining collectively constructed communities after WWI in that period. In the Koçgiri rebellion it is crucial to mention the impact of "Kurdish nationalism" but more importantly, the religious conflict and the centralization/modernization process, which threatened the Dersimi powers'/people's daily life and caused a resistance rather than a rebellion. The idea of saving the Sunni Caliphate announced by Mustafa Kemal was not valid for the Dersim Alevis. Also, the Kurdish autonomists had an influence on Nuri Dersimi who was one of the most important figures of the rebellion. Also inevitably, the centralist and nationalist/Sunni policies of the CUP period was also on of another most effective dynamics of the rebellion.[47]

On account of appeasing the demands of the Koçgiri rebellion, the *heyet-i nasıha*[48](advisory commission) was sent to Koçgiri by TBMM(Turkish Grand National Assembly) in order to convince the leaders that the Sevres Treaty promised a "Kurdistan" to Kurds and an Armenia in the same region.[49] After this propaganda of the Ankara government, the leader of the Ferhatuşağı tribe Diyap Agha, one of the leaders of Abasan tribe Meço Ağa, Hasan Hayri Bey from Karabel tribe and his cousins Ahmet Ramiz Bey and Mustafa Zeki Bey, were persuaded to join the Turkish Parliament.

---

[46] Öz, Baki. *Belgelerle Koçgiri Olayı.* İstanbul: Can, 1999. P 24-25.

[47] Nuri Dersimi was a member of *Kürdistan Teali Cemiyeti*(Society for the Rise of Kurdistan, KTC).

[48] Şefik Bey was the chief of the commission.

[49] Güneş, Ergin. "Koçgiri İsyanı Ekseninde Dersim Direnişi". in*2. Uluslararası Tunceli (Dersim) Sempozyumu'nda Sunulan Bildirileri 20 –22 Eylül 2013.* Tunceli: Tunceli Üniversitesi. 2014.

According to Akyürekli that was attempt of integration and the Dersimis saw the Turkish Republic, as a hope for themselves.[50] Yet in that period there was no "Republic" exactly in practice except for the TBMM. In the early 1920s it is hard to describe Mustafa Kemal as a bringer of "equality" or anti feudalism, because he was using the same apparatus as the Ottoman tradition: for example, cooperation with feudal leaders. The studies that depict Mustafa Kemal as anti-feudal are obviously not valid. Even in principle, even if an opposition to feudal leaders existed in Mustafa Kemal's mind, he would also need to make negotiations with them.

However, the word "Republic" represents the state in an imaginative and an anachronic way, which Akyürekli regards as a solution to the "Dersim issue". In addition to that, those deputies defended themselves to Seyit Rıza, who was an important figure/authority in Dersim, by highlighting their own mission "to make the rights of Kurdistan accepted by the state."'[51] Therefore, even getting into parliament did not provide a hundred percent guarantee of the alliance between the state and the Dersimis. Also, that approach seems to have aimed to create closeness between the Republic and Alevis.

While the political maneuvers of the TBMM were continuing, military maneuvers were also applied to repress the *Koçgiri Kürt Hadisesi* (Koçgiri Kurdish Event).[52] By command of Nurettin Pasha and TopalOsman the rebellion of the "civil turmoil" was repressed in a bloody way. Nurettin Pasha, known as a very cruel pasha, left a negative trace in the collective memory of Dersim.[53] Especially with the appointment of Nurettin Pasha's son-in-law Abdullah Alpdoğan as governor to region the traumatic memories of repression of Koçgiri rebellion were recalled in Dersim 1937-38. As a matter of fact, the Dersim literature,

---

[50] Akyürekli, 2011. Pg 50.
[51] Bulut, Faik. 2005. *Dersim Raporları*. İstanbul: Evrensel. Pg. 90
[52] İbid.pg 90-91.
[53] Soileau, Dilek. "Koçgiri ve Dersim Kürt hareketliliği: Koçgirili Alişer Efendi ve Nuri Dersimi'nin rolüne dair" 335-356 in der. Şükrü Arslan. 2011. *Herkesin Bildiği Sır: Dersim*. İstanbul: İletişim.

particularly novels on Dersim 1937-1938, have a lot of images from the Koçgiri rebellion that are mostly based on recalling of violence applied by Nurettin Pasha.

In the meantime, after the suppression of Koçgiri Alişer, who was one of the local relationship coordinators and propagandists of Kurdishness in the region, and Nuri Dersimi managed to escape from the arrest. They also became influential figures in Dersim in 1937-1938 whose trace can be followed in the novels of Dersim in 1937-1938. Koçgiri was the last wide repercussion for Kurdish rebellion/resistance before the official promulgation of the Turkish Republic in 1923. Yet, the rebellion failed to spread around Kurdistan because of its Alevi character. This situation also can be considered as one of the reasons for failure of the rebellion. The rebellion received attention but didn't succeed in breaking the agreement between TBMM and the Sunni Kurds due to the promises of the Mustafa Kemal and his group[54], and the loyalty of the Sunnis to the Turkish rule. That was indicated by the validity of the Kurdish-Turkish tied fate in that period, which would immediately change after the politics of newly established ideology of the Republic.

Sheikh Said Rebellion (1925)

In 1923 the Turkish Republic was officially founded and the promises about Kurdish rights lost their chance. In addition to that, the abolition of the Caliphate--the last connection between the Kurds and the state--failed and consequently triggered nationalism among the Kurds, especially the Sunni Kurds, who made up the majority.[55] The Koçgiri rebellion was perceived as an Alevi rebellion and for this reason, although it had a Kurdish nationalist atmosphere, it did not spread all over Kurdistan. However, after the foundation of the Republic, the relationship with the state was stricter/clearer and religion/ethnicity etc. changed dramatically. The Kemalist principles were basically aimed at Turkish and certain kind of

[54] Bozarslan, Hamit. 2008. *Türkiyenin Modern Tarihi*. İstanbul: Avesta Pg 42-43.
[55] Brunessen, 2003. Pg393

Sunni state. The populism principle of the Republic, for example, denied the other ethnic origin and led the Kemalist regime to "scientifically" prove that the other ethnicities were also Turk. Moreover, there was a great fear about the "same sequel" with the Armenians.[56] In the general atmosphere of the new built Turkish Republic the state begun to make radical changes in order to construct the Turkish nation. For the Kurdish people, these changes entailed undesirable consequences such as loss of connection with Turkishness, which was central to being Muslim, the exile of the some Kurdish local powers, the restriction of Kurdish language, the ethnical ignorance and discrimination, nonfulfillment of governmental duties in the Kurdistan region.

These consequences triggered the Kurdish nationalist movement that was not as motivated now as before the foundation of the Republic.

The rebellion started in 1925 under the leadership of the Naqshbandi Sheikh Said after a one-year of preparation.[57] The official history emphasizes the religious part of the rebellion, it always implies that the event was a "reactionary" movement, and roots of the rebellion had always been marked as an "exterior provocation".[58] According to the "exterior" approach, the British, aimed to weaken the Turks, and therefore, they created a Turkish-Kurdish conflict in which the Kurds did not trapped. The process of rebellion and the cause of rebellion were directly connected to intervention by the British since they considered Kurdish people to be a "mass" that can be persuaded anytime. According to that approach, despite all of the provocation of the British, the Kurdish public preferred the Kemalist regime instead of the

[56] Ibid. 413.
[57] Akyürekli, 2011. Pg 51.
[58] Zeyrek, Suat. "Milli Mücadele Sürecinde Türk-İngiliz Rekabeti: Kürt Sorunu" in *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, C. 23/Bahar, 2013. Pg 108-137.

Kurdish separatists, who were a "shadow" of the British, and the Turks and Kurds are a side and the British are the factious.[59]

In addition to the 'British' approach, also, on one hand the Kurdish rebels were considered as *Kürtçü*[60] which threatened the *Cumhuriyet* (Republic). On the other hand, ironically the rebellion's nationalistic character was underrated/neglected by the official history, because according to that the Kurds were not "civilized" to have nationalist thoughts.[61]

The depiction of the Kemalist oriented studies of the Sheikh Said rebellion, in that context, seems to ignore the subjectivity of the Kurds by picturing a "brotherhood" between the Kurds and Turks.[62] Also, it blames the British as the "common" enemy and legitimizes the loss of Mosul. Additionally, it puts all kinds of demands of the Kurds about Kurdishness, in a negative position which would be supported by the "common enemy" the British. In that way, the rebels of the Sheikh Said rebellion labeled as 'a handful of schemer's and the Kurdishness dimension of the event was ignored.

Although the rebellion was a reaction for the changing situation which affected the Kurdistan region, it was supported by a minority of Kurds.[63] In addition to that, despite the fact that the rebellion had emphasized Kurdishness, at the time, Alevi Dersim was not involved in the process substantially. The "saving of the Caliphate" emphasis of the rebellion was the basic reason for that, because for the Alevis the "secular" state was better than the Sunni one, which was thought as being guaranteed by the new regime of Mustafa Kemal as Alevi. According to

---

[59] Ibid. 128-129.

[60] This word is used for Kurdish nationalist or as Kurdish separator.

[61] Koç, Nurgün." Şeyh Sait Ayaklanması" in *Turkish Studies*. Volume 8/2, Winter 2013, Ankara, p153-156

[62] Following sources can be counted some example of that approach:Yılmazçelik, İbrahim. 2010. *Dersim Sancağının Kırılmasından Sonra Karşılaşılan Güçlükler ve Dersim Sancağı ile İlgili Bu Dönemde Yazılan Raporlar (1875-1918) OTAM*(Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi)Sayı: 28 Sayfa: 163-214; Akgül, Suat. 1992. *Yakın Tarihimizde Dersim İsyanları ve Gerçekler*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları.

[63] Akyol, Mustafa. The Origin of Turkey's Kurdish Question: An Outcome of the Breakdown of the Ottoman Ancient Regime. Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History MA. 2006.

Akyürekli, the people of Dersim kept alive their hopes about the Republic, and thus, some tribal leaders went to Elazığ and reported their loyalty to the state. However, Seyit Rıza neither supported the rebellion openly, nor gave an allegiance promise to the state. For Nuri Dersimi the passive position of Dersim towards the Sheikh Said rebellion was a *gaflet (blindness, unawareness)* of the bad situation in Kurdistan, which was compatible with the Turkish government's interests.[64]

Although Dersim was passive during the rebellion and Seyit Rıza did not actively participate in the rebellion, he was not completely out of the process. The relationship between Hasan Hayri, Nuri Dersimi and the meeting with Sheikh Said, can count as at least an intention to participate in the rebellion. One of the supporters of the rebellion from Dersim was the Dersim deputy Hasan Hayri Bey because of his opposition to Mustafa Kemal in the elections of 1923. Mustafa Kemal nominated Feridun Fikri as the candidate of Dersim. The Dersim tribes, who wanted Hasan Hayri Bey as deputy of Dersim, in order to react to this decision went to Hozat under the leadership of Seyit Rıza. Mustafa Kemal ordered to remove Hasan Hayri and Nuri Dersimi who had been charged to be responsible of this reaction from Dersim. However, they sought refuge with Seyit Rıza, and according to Akyürekli, in order to prevent the continuous involvement of the Dersim Alevis in the Sheikh Said rebellion, the government was not insistent on the removal of Hasan Hayri Bey and Nuri Dersimi's from Dersim yet. This became a bad reputation for Seyit Rıza. That precaution indicates an important point that although at first the Republic was demonstrated as a better regime for the Alevis, they were seen as "potential rebels" and "potential Kurdish separatist". Those two thoughts collapsed the propaganda of the Turkish Republic, which asserted that the new regime was better than the Ottoman regime, which was always hostile to the Alevis. Additionally, because of the heterodox religion of Alevi people the official discourse depicted

[64] Dersimi, Nuri. 1994. *Kürdistan Tarihinde Dersim*.İstanbul: Zel.pg 125-127.

them as potential "intended citizenship", but it was also obvious that meant a *tedbil* (discipline)and *tenkil* (banishment, punishment) process, which is also the name of the Dersim Massacre. As a matter of fact, the explanation is Nuri Dersimi, in a way accepts that: According to Nuri Dersimi, the reason why the government did not attack Dersim at that time was to postpone the "Dersim issue" to another date.[65]

After the repression of the rebellion, Hasan Hayri was executed with his cousin Celal Mehmet and Galip Bey in Elazığ *İstiklal Mahkemeleri* (independence tribunals). Ahmet Kahraman indicates that the Ottoman tradition which was manipulating the Sunnis against the Alevis, turned to provoke Alevis against the Sunnis in the Republican era.[66] This shows that despite the religious distinction between Sunni Kurds and Alevi Dersim, Dersim Alevis were not pleased about the Kemalist Regime as much as the Sunni Kurds. Kahraman also adds that Sheik Said and Seyit Rıza had a meeting together with Nuri Dersimi and Alişer before the Sheikh Said rebellion, and Seyit Rıza was respectful towards Sheikh Said.[67] In the spotlight of these involvements of Seyit Rıza in the Sheikh Said rebellion, it is possible to point that the politics of the new regime towards the Sunni and Alevi Kurds/Zaza in that period did not make them move together or have a harmony; it made the majority of these groups feel insecure.

Besides being a repression for the Kurds, the Sheikh Said rebellion, became a legitimizing area of the cantered/rigid state politics, which was applied with an anti-sedition law, or *Takriri Sükun* (Law to Maintain Public Order), Martial Law and closed the *Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası* (Progressive Republic Party). With the Sheikh Said rebellion, the Kemalist ideology was sharpened, which, it is possible to say, caused the Dersim massacres of 1937-38 directly and indirectly. The sharpened Kemalist ideology became more decisive after

---

[65] Dersimi, Nuri. *Kürdistan Tarihinde Dersim*. Pg 126.
[66] Kahraman, Ahmet. *Kürt İsyanları*.İstanbul: Evrensel, sayfa 77
[67] İbid. Pg 77-79.

the rebellion and the "eradication" of the "internal enemies" became the mission of the state. Also, it is important to mention that, the development and deployment of the Turkish Air Force after 1925[68] worked in Dersim 1937-1938 very "productively" and left a huge trace in Dersim's collective memory.

The Sheikh Said rebellion opened a rigid, reformist and more oppressive page in the young Republican era. With this rebellion the young regime gained a legitimization tool which exactly fitted in the nationalistic discourse/ideology of the state. The secularization and nation building process of the state found the "public enemies" and therefore, any oppositional voice could be heard either with the danger of *gericilik* (regression) or *bölücülük* (separation).

Laicism Alevism and Sheikh Said Rebellion

The modernization moves of the Kemalist regime, which was also captured closing the *Tekkes* (Dervish convents) and *Türbes* (shrines), was seemingly aimed at a "laic" state approach. After the rebellion, for the "application" of those reforms, the state arrested 7500 people and executed 600 people with the help of Martial Law and contribution of Independency Tribunals.[69] In the case of Dersim, regression seemed to not be a danger because of the Alevi sect, which was supposed to be more secular and more coherent to the state than the Sunni Kurds. Hamit Bozarslan's explanation of the works on the relationship between the Alevis and state is fruitful for understanding the Dersim case with one of the three following approaches:

> "The Alevis were repressed by the despotic Sunni Ottoman State for centuries and were opposed to it;

[68] Olson, Robert. "The Kurdish rebellions of Sheikh Said (1925), Mt. Ararat (1930), and Dersim (1937-8): Their impact on the development of the Turkish Air Force and on Kurdish and Turkish nationalism." *Welt des Islams* 40.1 (2000): 67-94.

[69] Zürcher, Eric Jan. Turkey: A Modern History. Pg 173.

> Later on, they contracted an alliance with the "secular" Kemalist Regime against Sunni domination and theocracy;
>
> In the Post-Kemalist period, they became, once again, opponents of the 'anti-secularist' and "reactionary" state. This changing attitude is to be explained by the democratic and secularist nature of Alevism, which "naturally" contracted with left-wing opposition in Turkey". [70]

According to Bozarslan, this conceptualization actually serves as a method of legitimization of the state politics. As a matter of fact the laicism, which was what the new regime designed, was not freedom of religion but was amounted to a certain kind of Sunnism, which excluded the Alevi people. In other words, the laicism of the state was not an ideology which brought a democratic, pluralist, respectful *laikcumhuriyet* (laic republic), but it imagined a certain kind of citizens who were loyal to the country, open to westernization within the framework designed by the state, citizens, who were Turks, and finally Sunnis who were *de facto* Turkish. The laicism of Mustafa Kemal, therefore, was a substitution for religion and nation.

Cemal Karakaş explains that with the following: "The Kemalist state had thus created for itself a monopoly of interpretation, i.e., sole exegetical authority for Sunni Islam and in doing so committed itself to supporting it."[71] The laicism of the Republic was basically the application of the Turkish Sunni way of living that was determined by the Kemalist ideology. There was also an official base for that ideology. *Diyanet İşleri Bakanlığı* (the Presidency of Religious Affairs) founded in 1924 became a takeover of certain kind of Sunni Islam and an institute of integration of the Kemalist state building project.[72] Sunni Islam, in one sense, became a state religion of the "laic" state. Therefore, the other religious minorities stayed out

---

[70]Bozarslan, Hamit. 2003. "Alevism and the Myths of Research: the need for a new Research Agenda" Pg 3-15 in White, Paul Joseph, and Joost Jongerden, eds. *Turkey's Alevi Enigma: A Comprehensive Overview*. Vol. 88. Brill, Pg 3

[71] Karakas, Cemal. (2007). "Turkey: Islam und Laicism between the interests of state, politics, and society." PRIF Reports No. 78 . pg. III.

[72] İbid, pg. 39

of the official desire. The accepted discourse on the reaction of the Dersim Alevi people as explained above, is mostly based upon a progressivists point of view which can be summed up this way: The Dersimis, who were persecuted in the Ottoman Empire because of being Alevi, had high hopes for laicism, which was supposed to emancipate all kind of religious minorities from the suppression of the cruel Ottoman state.[73]Despite of this discourse, which canonizes the new and disgraces the old, the practice of the state actually punctured the Alevi-State relationship depicted in the works on Dersim. As a matter of fact, the state, by pointing out the *seyit, dede, agha* as the targets, made a significant intervention, which can also be considered as a destruction, to the whole structure of the Alevi people of Dersim.

The most vital example of contradiction between the ideology and the practice is the discourse of *fighting against feudalism*, through which the Kemalist regime aimed to tame and domesticate Dersimis. That agenda brought the military maneuvers against Dersim and resulted in the massacre. Also, it legitimized the maneuvers by emphasizing discourses of "manipulation of religion by the dedes, *seyits*" and "fighting with feudal local powers." The intervention and transportation were introduced as measures "civilizing" and "saving" people from the hands of "cruel" *seyits*, *aghas* or *dedes*. Therefore, the laicism propaganda of the Kemalist regime, which was introduced as a secular, safe and democratic state, brought the process of Dersim 1937-1938 massacre and ten years of ongoing exile, which left a deep trauma on Dersim Alevis. For example, The "Lost Girls of Dersim 1937-1938[74]" grew up in the Sunni houses and converted to Sunnism mostly to survive in society. The state opened mosques in the Alevi villages which were actually a "break-in," and the *Diyanet* promoted only Sunni Islam, which excluded Alevis and non-Muslims although they paid the taxes to

[73] Akyürekli (2011) 50-51.

[74] Gündoğdu, Nezahat ve Kazım Gündoğdu. Dersimin Kayıp Kızları. İstanbul: İletişim, 2012. Most of the testimonies of the book Show that the "lost girls" was raised as Sunni Turk housewifes.

those institutions. Moreover, it never put the *Cem Evleri* (Djemevi) in an acceptable statue.[75] That *sui generis* laicism aimed to homogenize different confessional communities, and it made a guaranteed power over the public that was not Turkish or Sunni.

Although there has been a huge discussion on the Republican tradition of Dersim Alevi people, or the tendency to support Republican Public Party (Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi), which is known as the "party of the Atatürk", it is possible to point out that the laicism, which was built by Atatürk in that period, was not really aimed at the emancipation of the Alevi people or any other religious freedom. Yet, it was a manipulation of the religion in a modern way and a method of discipline of the sharp sides of the heritage that came from Ottoman Empire such as the "rebellious Alevis", "regressive Sheikh Said" or "Kurdish separators". The Alevis were illegitimated and alienated in the late Ottoman period because of the instrumentalizetion of Sunni Islam as protector[76]of the state. Yet, in the Republican period, they were embraced by being put into the laps of the Sunni sect in a more "modern" manner. In the Republican period, the "gradual approach" to Dersim, changed into clear, rigid assimilation policies, and the military movement turned into *çıbanı söküp atmak* (eradication of the boil).

Therefore, the identity of the Dersim begun to be built upon the ground that since Alevism was in contradiction with the Sunnism of the majority of the Kurds it was easily adopted to history of the *ancient* Turkishness. Such a point distinguished Dersimis from the Kurds, who were labeled as more "ignorant'" and "regressive" especially after the Sheikh Said rebellion. Reha Çamuroğlu's remark is very elucidatory on that point: "the 'Alevi Paradise Anatolia' of the single party regime is a country of the tales which gives enjoyment to the listeners, but it did not give the same enjoyment to those who lived there".[77] The introduction of laicism in euphuism and its connection to the imagined Turkish-Alevi roots, as Bozarslan indicated

[75] Ateş, Kazım. "Turkish Nationality and and The Ambiguous Status of The AleviCitizen within the National Community". Turkish Year Book of Human Rights, Vol. 26-30, 2004-2008. Pg 61-85.
[76] Deringil, 1998. Pg 82.
[77] Çamuroğlu, Reha.(1998) 'Resmi İdeoloji ve Aleviler' in *Birikim 105-06: 1142-18.*

above, was basically a dogmatic acceptance which has been feeding the Kemalist ideology. The meaning of laicism in the Kemalist ideology was to fight with *irtica* (reactionist) by the means of the "nationalization of Sunnism"[78].In the long term, the laicism of the state showed its flaw in terms of non-Muslims citizens.[79]

Besides the laicism doctrine of the Turkish Republic, the nationalization process of the state also pushed Dersim into a periphery that became the "orient" of the Kemalist elites and completed the modernization mission of the young Republic. Beginning with the latest decades of the Ottoman Empire, Turkishness increasingly was becoming the main ideology of the state.[80]

Until the Lausanne Treaty, the Kurdish issue was discussed even by Mustafa Kemal on the ground of autonomy or the base of togetherness. Ziya Gökalp, who was a semi Kurdish sociologist, influenced the Kemalist regime in order to solve the Kurdish issue that was becoming more "dangerous" due to the idea of supremacy of the Turkishness and the recommendation of acceptance of assimilation to other ethnicities, especially with motions in *Türkçülüğün Esasları*.[81] According to Dowall, until the Lausanne Treaty, the Kurdish issue was accepted, and the emphasis focused on the brotherhood and representation rights.[82] After the Lausanne Treaty, the state gained its self-esteem and began to apply the reforms that would develop the "nation state". Approaches of Ziya Gökalp became the policy of the Republic.

---

[78] Bozarslan, pg 9.

[79] Bali, Rıfat. N. *20 Kura Nafıa Askerleri*. İstanbul: Kitapevi, 2008. *Akar, Rıdvan ve Hülya Demir.* ***İstanbul'un Son Sürgünleri.*** *İstanbul: Doğan Yayınları, 2014. Baskın Oran, "Azınlıklar",* ***İstanbul Ansiklopedisi,*** *İstanbul: NTV Yayınları, 2010. Serdar Korucu, Aris Nalcı.* ***1965 /2015'ten 50 yıl önce, 1915'ten 50 yıl sonra.*** *İstanbul Ermeni Kültür Yayınları,2014.*

[80] Çağaptay, Soner. 2006. Who is a Turk?. Londan: Routledge. Pg 41.

[81] Gökalp, Ziya. (1973) *Türkçülüğün Esasları*. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.

[82] McDowall, David. 2003. *Modern History of the Kurds*. IB Tauris,. Pg 188-189.

The old Kurdish deputies were not allowed to be elected again, while the new deputies were not elected but nominated by the state. Moreover, in the region the senior administrative positions were filled by the Turks instead of the Kurds. A Kurd could be kaymakam under a condition of being completely clear from the nationalist defects. The official references to Kurdistan were cleaned, and place names in Kurdish begun to be changed into Turkish. In addition to that, the language unity became a crucial part of the Turkishness process and with this step, Kurdish was forbidden in the Turkish Republic. As a basic requirement of the accomplishment of assimilation, in 1920s, the state tried to make Turkish the only education language and prohibited any other ethnic languages.[83]

Besides that, the Kemalist regime even used science such as anthropology or history in order to prove the Turkishness of the Kurds, and that they appeared as the result of geographical closeness to Iran and the Arabs areas which spoilt Turkish. Dowall points that the politics of the regime was clearly racist that recommended to expunge all non-Turkish evidences.[84]

In this context it is possible to point out that the Sheikh Said rebellion not only fitted well with the laicism argument but also with the ethnic emphasis of the state. As a matter of fact, Dowall indicates the rebellion was a "pretext" of the state for dealing with many of its enemies.[85] In 1920s, *Türk Ocakları* (Turkish Ocaks) reactivated by the "desire"of Atatürk[86], became an instrument of spreading Turkish nationalism and *de facto* to convince the Kurds that they were actually Turks.

The 1924 Constitution indicated the state as a "national" state which was Turkish and disclaimed the other nations. According to Yeğen, from 1924 to 1930, the state, followed

---

[83] Çağatay, Soner. *Türkiye'de İslam, Laiklik ve Milliyetçilik Türk Kimdir?* Trans. Özgür Bircan. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2009. Pg 31

[84] McDowall. 2003. pg 192.

[85] İbid, 196.

[86] Kodal, Tahir. "Mustafa Kemal Atatürk ve Türk Ocakları" in A.Ü. Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi [TAED] 52, Erzurum, 2014. Pg 295-314.

assimilation methods or invited the Kurds to be Turk.[87] However, because of the resistance of Kurds to the nation state, the authoritarian atmosphere of 1930s and extreme Turkish nationalism, which referred to the genealogy of Turks, no longer needed invitation to Kurds to be Turks, because according to the state, they did not exist anymore. The Sheikh Said rebellion was an early example of that denying attitude, which was recorded as a "reactionary" rebellion and neglected the nationalist remarks of the state. Mustafa Kemal, with the help of that rebellion, suppressed all his opponents' voices in politics, military and public. [88]

That increasing severe nationalism in the state ideology, in that context, reached a greater level, which also had a great effect on the Kurds. Yeğen's depiction of the state discourse on the Kurds is very crucial to analyze the Dersim issue. According to Yeğen, after the promulgation of the Republic, the state discourse has always indicated the "Kurdish issue" but never used the name Kurds. Instead, it drew the problem as related to *aşiret direnci* (tribal resistance), *eşkiyalık* (banditry), *ecnebi kışkırtması* (external provocation) and finally *bölgesel geri kalmışlık* (regional backwardness).[89] In other words, especially the reformist period of the Republic, from the point of view of Turkish nationalism, Kurdish resistance was a resistance to civilization, which meant resistance to construction of a modern state and a modern society. In the Dersim case, the tribal resistance and banditry were the most often used discourses, and yet, in 1930s the external provocation claim also became a reason for the operations towards Dersim. As a non-Turkish, non- Sunni region, Dersim, although in the context of laicism, tried to be counted as a "natural" part of the new Republic, the discourse of being original Turks of the Kemalist modernism as a state ideology, left Dersim on the edge of the state. The distance between Dersim and the center, in the context of nationalism, made Dersim more and

---

[87] Yeğen, Mesut. "Türk Milliyetçiliği ve Kürt Sorunu" in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Milliyetçilik* 4 pg (2008) 880.
[88] Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergance of Modern Turkey*. London: Oxford University Press, 1968. Pg 276
[89] Yeğen, Mesut. 1999. Devlet Söyleminde Kürt Sorunu. İstanbul: İletişim. Pg 20.

more marginalized. The images of the Dersim region and the Dersim Alevis opened a very expansive sphere for application of the nationalist/modernist discourses of the Republic.

Dersim 1937-1938

After the Sheikh Said rebellion, in 1926, the state began a military movement against the Koçuşağı tribe, which is defined as "incorrigible" in Fevzi Çakmak's reports, and recommended to make a military movement against them.[90] Although it was evaluated as a "public crime", the reports show that the Koçuşağı *Tedibi* (disciplining)was a part of the main target regarding Dersim. The emphasis of the Turkishness of the state shows that the reason behind the military maneuver to Koçuşağı was not to provide public order but to discipline and tame Dersim step by step according to the Kemalist regime's desire. The description of the tribe by Akyürek as one 'prone to swag and rebellion" in reports show that even if there is a public crime there, the main target of the state was not solving it but taming/disciplining as a part of the *tebdil* and *tenkil* policies.[91] Seyit Rıza and some other tribes supported the state in that maneuver. Yet, that support did not continue until the end of the events. Seyit Rıza and the other tribes withdrew from supporting the state because of the increase of the violence in the state, and they even prevented a larger slaughter of the Koçuşağı tribe by the state.

In 1930, the *Pülümür Harekatı* (Pülümür movement) also occurred as a severe attack with the help of warplanes of the state and caused according to state 1500, and according to witnesses around 3000 casualties.

[90] Baran, Taha. 2014. 1937-1938 Yılları Arasında Basında Dersim. İstanbul: İletişim. Pg 24.

[91] Akyürekli, pg 52. "Çemişgezek, Ali Boğazı ve Tağar Deresi bölgesindeki köylerde outran bu aşiret öteden beri soygun ve yağmaya yatkın ve asi bir karakter taşıyordu."

The last two maneuvers of the state and the attitude of the Seyit Rıza towards the maneuvers, consolidated the position of Seyit Rıza in the eyes of the state, which was already aimed to overcome that "uncontrollable" power. As a matter of fact, Naşit Hakkı Uluğ, describes Seyit Rıza as "a tumor in the dark consciousness of Dersim," and according to Uluğ, with the existence of Seyit Rıza Dersim can neither be Turkish nor human.[92] The most influenced event of the process was the attack of Sin in 1933. That did not remain simply as an attack but became a turning point for the relationship of the state and Dersim.

Seyit Rıza's son, who was respected and known as the forerunner of Seyit Rıza, was killed by the Kırgan, one of the tribe members. It is also said that he was killed by the order of Abdullah Alpdoğan[93], Kırganlı Mehmet, in the Sin village.[94] Seyit Rıza in order to take the revenge for his son, attacked the village and attacked the gendarme station of Sin, which protected the murderer of Baba İbrahim.[95] According to Akyürekli, that power of Seyit Rıza, who attacked the station and seized the village, was proceeding from the failure of the state

[92] Uluğ, Neşit Hakkı. 2011. Derebeyi ve Dersim. İstanbul: Kaynak. Pg 34,49. First edition; Uluğ, 1932. Derebeyi ve Dersim. İstanbul: Hâkimiyeti Milliye Matbaası. The name of the press can give a clue about the function of the book besides the content. Uluğ, with this book, Show the state discourse very clearly for that time. As a matter of fact that 'anger' against to Seyit Rıza, can be counted as an evident the witnesses'' claims about the death of Bavo (bava-baba) İbrahim, the son of Seyit Rıza. According to a blog issued on *Radikal* website, Düzgün Veroz (Tosun), the state is the murderer of the Baba İbrahim. http://blog.radikal.com.tr/yasam/seyit-rizanin-oglu-baba-ibrahimin-oldurulmesi-41805 connection date: 21.03.2015

[93]Orhan, Mehmet. "Kurdish Rebellions and Conflict Groups in Turkey during the 1920s and 1930s" in Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs Vol. 32, No. 3, September 2012, 339–358. Pg 351. The date of attack is given as 1937 at that article.

[94] Bilal Civelek in his novel named *Mustafa Kemal'in Kuşları Dersim Yanıyor,* blames Nuri Dersimi as the organizer of that murder. According to novel, Dersimi was an English agent and in order to force Seyit Rıza to start the war, made Baba İbrahim killed by the two Armenian 'assassins'. Nuri Dersimi who is described as a Kurdish separatist and British agent, not surprisingly cooperate another 'enemy' of the state, Armenians. That specific example, shows the different 'interpretation', conspiracy theories developed around that event. In Munzur Çem's novel, on the other hand, the state is the murderer. More detailed analyse of that is in the third chapter.

[95] Another version of this attack, exists in Munzur Çem's novel *Gülümse Ey Dersim.* According to novel, the state assassinated Baba İbrahim in order to worsen the hostility between Seyit Rıza's tribe and Kırgan tribe and so that destroy the possibility of "unity of Kurds" and foundation of Kurdistan. More detailed analysis of that is in the third chapter.

that could not liquidate the "dominance of the feudal lords".[96] That approach which is very dominant in the Dersim 1937-1938 literature, is actually used very often in order to signal the local powers as 'guilty' of the massacre.

The *Umumi Müfettişlik* (general inspectorship) which was formed as an administrative organization in order to both provide the continuity of the project of nation building, the reordering of the relationship with the Kurds and application of the population policies in a more systematic and extensive way[97], became very influential in that process. As a matter of fact, after İsmet Pasha's visit of the eastern region in 1935, he both prepared a report and also put General Inspector Abidin Özmen in charge of making deeper research.[98] This research, made the Dersim movement which was planned to be done, more concrete: the date, the method in a way became clearer.[99] The reports of Fevzi Çakmak, which emphasized assimilation, recommended governing Dersim as a colony in order to increase the success of assimilation policies.[100] The official attitudes towards Dersim, therefore, gives some clues on the process that came with *Tunceli Kanunu* (Tunceli Law) in 1935 and *Sel Hareketi* (Sel movement) in 1937-1938.

The *Şark Islahat Planı* (Plan of Reforming East) which was prepared after the Sheikh Said rebellion, foresaw the whole process of bringing Dersim 1937-1938. The foundation of general inspectorship actually meant a totalitarian governing, which was very proper for the application of the "reforming of the east".

As a part of that, the population and the settling policies had crucial places in the government agenda. As a matter of fact, the settlement law, which was offered first in 1932, and 1934

---

[96] Akyürekli, 2011. Pg 54.
[97] Yüksel, Murat. "Ulus Devletin Dersimle Teması" pg 357-371 in *Herkesin Bildiği Sır Dersim*. Pg 368
[98] Öztürk, Saygı. 2008. *İsmet Paşa'nın Kürt Raporu*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap. Pg 71.
[99] Akyürekli, 2011. Pg 55
[100] Bulut, Faik.2005. Dersim Raporları. İstanbul: Evrensel pg 77.

approved *İskan Kanunu*[101](settlement law), under those political conditions, became the source of "social engineering." In fact, that law was not about having a different perception than general attitudes towards Dersim, which deemed it as rebellious. In that context, this can be understood from the explanation of the governors' reports, such as İsmet Pasha's reports in the newspaper stating that only Turkish could claim ethnic and racial rights,[102] or Esat Bozkurt's explanation, which implied the non-Turkish were slaves.[103] Therefore, the eastern punishment plan, in that context, deemed to be a real punishment including social engineering, population policies, assimilation and eradication.

The Settlement law, therefore, signified a widespread social, cultural intervention instead of a place movement. As a matter of fact, while Beşikçi defines the law as the assimilation of the Kurds[104], Uğur Mumcu evaluates it not as assimilation but as liquidation of the feudal structure in the east[105].

Hüseyin Aygün, on the other hand, indicates that the law, in fact, was prepared considering Dersim.[106] The law classifies the people in four groups: "Turkish speaking," "Turkish," "from Turkish culture but cannot speak Turkish", "not from Turkish culture and cannot speak

---

[101]*İskan Kanunu* has a crucial impact on the Dersim novels, which aim to legitimize the Dersim 1937-1938. The law according to those novels, brought "equality" to the poor people and the local powers. Yet, those local Powers, including Seyit Rıza, in order to not accept that "equalitarian" law, rebelled against the state, again according to those novels. Bilbaşar's novel especially emphasises that which is analysed in the third chapter.

[102]*Milliyet* 31 August 1930. The original text is as following: "Bu ülkede sadece Türk ulusu ırksal haklar talep etme hakkına sahiptir. Başka hiç kimsenin böyle bir hakkı yoktur."

[103]*Milliyet,* 19 September 1930. The original text is as following:*Biz Türkiye denen dünyanın en hür ülkesinde yaşıyoruz. Mebusunuz inançlarından samimiyetle bahsetmek için buradan daha müsait bir ortam bulamazdı. Onun için hislerimi saklamayacağım. Türk bu ülkenin yegâne efendisi, yegâne sahibidir. Saf Türk soyundan olmayanların bu memlekette tek hakları vardır; hizmetçi olma hakkı, köle olma hakkı. Dost ve düşman, hatta dağlar bu hakikati böyle bilsinler!" This words is used especially by the leftist-Kurdish novelist in order to show the "racist" attitudes of the Turkish Republic to the 'reader' or 'addressee' of the novels.*

[104]Beşikçi, İsmail. 1977. *Bilim Yöntemi Türkiye'deki Uygulama 1, Kürtlrin 'Mecburi İskan'ı.* İstanbul: Komal. Pg 133.

[105] Mumcu, Uğur. 2004. *Kürt Dosyası.* 30. baskı Ankara: Umug. Pg 49-50.

[106] Aygün, Hüseyin. 2009. *Dersim 1938 ve Zorunlu İskân.* İstanbul: Dipnot. Pg 101.

Turkish".[107] Dersim, obviously, belonged to the fourth group which was the main target of the demographic policies in order to make them a member of the second group--Turkish.

Therefore, the law, in fact, became one of the legal bases of the *DersimHarekâtı* (Dersim movement) and the law basically aimed to change the demographic structure of the country in accordance with Turkish language and ethnicity.[108] The state began to design a history of Turkishness for the Dersim Alevis by manipulating the religious difference.[109] The Kurds and the other non-Turkish Muslims therefore were seen as the potential "Turkish" citizens of the country.[110] Yet, Dersim Alevis, in that context were imagined as "original Turks" who came from Khorasan. Despite the Sunni Kurds, the Zazas of Dersim were imagined as better candidates because of their "ignorance", "pure" characteristic and non-Sunni belief system, which was supposed to be more coherent to the new regime.[111] That perception formed the basic "orientalist" discourse of the "statist" novel on Dersim, which objectifies Dersimis and aims to "rescue" them from the cruelty of ignorance, unmerciful local powers.[112]

As a matter of fact, after the *İskan Kanunu* in 1935, the second important step was taken by *Tunceli Kanunu* (Tunceli Law). After the foundation of *4.Umum Müfettişliği* (The fourth General Inspectorship), the "Tunceli Vilayetinin İdaresi Hakkında Kanun" (The law on the Government of the Tunceli Province) dated 25 December, 1935 was passed and published in the *Resmi Gazete* (Official newspaper) on 2 January, 1936.That law was one of the other

---

[107]İbid. 102.

[108]Aydın, Songül. "1938'de Dersim'den batı illerine Zorunlu Göç", Zeliha Hepkon, Songül Aydın ve Şükrü Aslan (ed). 2013. *Dersimi Parantezden çıkarmak*. İstanbul: İletişim. Pg 98.

[109]Uluğ, Naşit Hakkı. 1939. *Tunceli Medeniyete Açılıyor*. İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Matbaası. Pg 31-32

[110] Soner Çağaptay, "Türklüğe Geçiş: Modern Türkiye'de Göç ve Din", Haldun Gülalp (ed). 2007.Vatandaşlık ve Etnik Çatışma, İstanbul: Metis. Pg 109.

[111]Uran, Hilmi. 1944. Bazı Şark Vilayetlerimizde tatbiki lüzumlu temsil tedbirleri hakkında rapordur (9 Kanunuevvel 1944) Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Cumhuriyet Arşivi.

[112]The novel of Demirtaş Ceyhun named *Asya* which is published in 1970 and take the TRT award, has a Kurdish protagonist who effected from the settlement lows and exiled. Yet, the laws although influenced the protagonist life very much, the novel, and the protagonist do not evaluate that as a failure of the state, but focus the 'struggle against imperialism and the 'comprador' Kurds such as Sheikh Said. Demirtaş Ceyhun. 1970. *Asya*. İstanbul: OK.

precautions of the state towards Dersim. From that date, Dersim became a *vilayet* (province) with its new name "Tunceli".[113] As a matter of fact, one of the influential figures of Dersim in 1937-1938, Abdullah Alpdoğan, in the frame of that law, was appointed as the *vali* – commander for the *4. Umum Müfettişliği* in 1936.[114] The authorization area of that statue was so extensive that it was actually autonomous. The *vali*- commander had the authority over the clients the way the ministers had. Also, the general inspector was able to punish and even export the civil clients. With the authorization of the change of the boundaries of districts, if it is thought as a necessary, and also the right of postponing the death sentence, the general inspectorship was functioning as an "emergency region" and seemed to aim to solve the Dersim issue "completely".

Bülent Bilmez indicates that the events named "Dersim 1938" should be evaluated in the frame of a long historical background and the success of fifteen years of radical standardization policies of the Republican regime.[115] In this context the question which appears in the evaluation of "Dersim 38" events remains between two edges: The policies named *tedib* (disciplining, suppression), which occurred because of the local attempts that were perceived as rebellion by the state and the local resistance towards the military expedition, which made the perception of modern/comprehensive penetration named "rebellion" by the state. That point of view, as it is evaluated below, determines the discourse of the fictional or non-fictional narrations/academic studies/evaluations etc. Yet, Bilmez adds that it is necessary to perceive the struggle between the state and Dersim as "inner conquest,"

---

[113] Baykara's novels Dersim 1937, Tunceli 1938 directly refers that 'naming'change which actually more then a name changing. As a matter of fact, in the Tunceli 1938, the protoganist, Binbaşı Kemal, wants Dersimis to call Dersim as Tunceli which actually represents the 'Republic' and its power. That is obviously, a part of Turkification of Dersim and in the novel that is the opnening of the Dersim to civilization/wisdom/education etc.

[114] In almost every novel on Dersim 1937-1938, mentions about Abdullah Alpdoğan. While imagining him as 'Republcian' good men in some novels, some others describe him as the aplicator of the 'assimilation and eradication' of Dersim as evaluated in the third chapter.

[115] Bülent Bilmez. "Sözlü Tarih ve Belgesel Film Aracılığıyla Bir Kıyımla Yüzleşmek ve Hesaplaşmak" Özgür Fındık.2012. *Kara Vagon*. İstanbul:Fam. Pg 22.

which actually reminds of the colonization arguments of the İsmet Pasha mentioned below. The Tunceli law, in this context, can be counted as an application of that "conquest" on the whole methods that could be necessary in realizing of targets on Dersim including, assimilation, military operation and creation of a new cultural background, such as claims that the Zaza people are the "original Turks." [116]

The construction of discourses about the feudalism, which "persecutes" the "pure" and "poor" people, and about the Republic that will save them, also had its reflection on the leftist literature, in the context of that times' general atmosphere, which recommended fighting against the "feudal system."[117]

Therefore Dersim, as the 'boil' of the Republic, should be removed and after a long time of the preparation process, the state completed its first concrete step/first stage with *Tunceli Kanunu*.

As a turning point, the Tunceli law initiated the start to the Dersim 1937-1938 process. Orderly, the second level was the fulfillment of the preparation of the attack (1936), the carnage of the some tribes ofİç Dersim (inner Dersim) (1937), the genocide (1938) and the mass killing during the "cleaning" of the remaining of resistance, which proceeded until 1941 and the gradual removal of the "forbidden zone" after years, and lastly, the mass exile, which proceeded until 1947. [118]

Back to the settlement law, which aimed to solve the "Dersim issue": it was necessary to reach inner Dersim to have the superiority in Dersim. Therefore the state, while providing control of the nearby provinces with the railways, military build-up and with the aim of the

---

[116] Akyürekli, 2011. Pg 72.

[117] The novels of Haydar Işık, Munzur Çem, for example have this discourse in the context of Kurdish 'resistance'. In their novels, Dersimis are 'still' ignorence and they are persecuted by the feudal leaders who bacame 'compradors' by supporting the Turkish state and forget their Kurdishness.

[118] Bülent Bilmez. "Sözlü Tarih ve Belgesel Film Aracılığıyla Bir Kıyımla Yüzleşmek ve Hesaplaşmak" Özgür Fındık.2012. *Kara Vagon*. İstanbul:Fam. 26.

collecting of guns, laid a siege to Dersim. As instruments of the "inner conquest", "road, schools and police stations" were used as methods of penetration of the region.

The expectation of the state, which was supposed to face a resistance to those interventions, on 4th May, 1937 Council of Ministers, including the signature of President Atatürk and Prime Minister İnönü, decided to give full authorization to use limitless violence in Dersim. The decision included exiles and a decisive operation; it also adds that as to have as many people among them as possible without considering the amount of the money. [119] That was the sign of the decisive attitude of the state about disciplining Dersim.

Here, it is necessary to digress to discuss the frame that Akyürekli uses to depict Dersim 1937-1938. Akyürekli evaluates the "Dersim events" with the interior and exterior dynamics of the Dersim, which constitute a certain discourse about the "Dersim events." The first interior reason is administrative problems of the Dersim, which are explained according to Akyürekli as "out of the sight" and "transportation" problems which caused the "administrative emptiness" and "chaos". Under those circumstances the "feudal lords" were "manipulating" this emptiness and strengthening their authority over the people by influencing the official governors in the region with activities such as bribery. Also, he adds that, the local powers, manipulated the "ignorance" of people, and because of the influence of feudal lords on the "state authority, "securing of justice was not possible. Therefore, in this frame, according to Akyürekli, "ignorance became the fate of the Kurdish people"[120]. With putting the "authority" of the state as a solution here, the state is depicted as in a "superior" position over the local social structure. In other words, that discourse actually claims that, if the state authority had already existed there, "Dersim events" could not have happen the way

[119] TBBMM Zabit-ı Ceridesi, Devre 5, İçtima 1 (21. İnikad) 161-218, Cilt 7, Ankara 1935. pg 175-181. Directed by Bilmez, ibid, 28.
[120] Akyürekli, 2011. Pg 62-63.

they did; however, "the state gave Dersim in to tribe feudality" and caused the Dersim 1937-1938.[121]

Akyürekli evaluates the "Construction of the Republican Ideology" as a second reason [122] According to him, the Kurds in the "east" were the main problem of the Republic because of the "feudal structure" and "tribalism." Collaterally to the first reason, this one also implies the "dangerousness" of the social structure of the east/Dersim/Kurds. In fact, in other words, because of the difficulty of assimilation of Kurds, the state made the region the target and this reason, in a way that perception supports the assimilation of the different identities. Also in this context, Akyürekli, adds the assimilation policies of the state, which were very racist such as mating Kurdish women with Turkish men, to create a fictional origin for the Dersimis and denying the Kurdishness of Dersimis. Yet, the evaluation of Akyürekli, again turns into objectifying the Dersimis by emphasizing the "abuse of the people by the religious and local leaders" under the title of "Ağalk, Seyitlik, Feodalite" (Agha, Seyit, Feudality).[123] Yet, adding troubles, which the local people experienced when they needed the help of the government such as not knowing Turkish to read-write, not being able to reach the government, seemed to be balancing act in order to not completely blame the local powers. Touching the failure of the state declared of the "objectivity" of the narration, which is supposed to make the "source" reliable.

As a matter of fact, although the assimilation policies of the state seems to be accepted, Akyürekli claims that the "feudal lords" propagandized "abusing Kurdishness and Alevism" and the fear of being killed by saying the "Ottomans will kill Qızılbash Kurds after the

[121] Bilbaşar novels *Cemo* and *Memo 1-2*, exactly build upon that idea which in fact purify the Republic, and judge the local Powers and some 'degenarate' governors in the region. Mustafa Yeşilova's novel *Kopo* is also based on the same idea, the 'pure' peasents were delivered to the 'cruel' aghas, feudal leaders and with the help of degenarated governers a 'tragedy' was experinced.
[122] Akyürekli, 2011. pg65-69.
[123] İbid,77.

Armenians"[124] in order to provoke people. In other words, with the help of the degenerate governors, as the members of "system of exploitation" the aghas and "compradors" of *seyits* put Dersim in that situation, according to Akyürekli.

It is obvious that, that discourse is very close to the official discourse, which displayed Dersimis under the "persecution" of the local and spiritual powers and the state as their "rescue "with usage of "civilization." As a matter of fact, Akyürekli, emphasizes that, while, Karabalı and Ferhatan tribes "had a lot of educated members" and supported the state, in the tribe of Seyit Rıza that was against the state almost all members were uneducated.[125] As the last interior reason, economic reasons can be summed with the following quotation from Akyürekli: "The need of food was the underlying cause of every uprising in Dersim which originated from the poverty and the strait".[126] The ethnic reason of the "rebellion," on the other hand, explained again in the frame of two edges. According to Akyürekli, East Dersim that had farm lands and had a weaker tribal connections, did not join the "rebellion" on the contrary to the Western Dersim tribes that had strong ties within the tribe. The modern/educated/working "Eastern Dersim", in other words, had a coherency with the state on the contrary to "Western Dersim" that did not have any of those qualities. The modernist view and the orientalist discourse concretes with the following sentences:

> "It was not possible to leave that socio cultural institution in a minute for the sake of the Republic. The people who were struggling against tough natural conditions, the strait, the poverty together, made an effort in the name of the struggle for life all together. This society that experienced the pains, the grief, mourning all together, were startled and affected from each funeral coming to

---

[124] 1992. Koçgiri Halk Hareketi. İstanbul: Komal. The expression of Sakallı Nıurettin Pasha as "Zo diyenleri temizledik. Lo diyenlerin köklerini de ben temizleyeceğim." (We killed the the people who say zo, and I will eradicate the people who say Lo) actually consists on base of the fear of Dersimis contrary to Mahmut Akyürekli's argument which evalutes it just as a "propaganda" in order to "purify" the Republic.

[125] This table connotates the "binary oppositions" which are basics of the 'thesis novel'. Akyürekli's narration in that context, seems to be a part of fictional narraations/novels evaluated in the third chapter.

[126] İbid, 83. "Dersim'deki her başkaldırının kökeninde fakirlik ve yokluğun sebep olduğu iaşe ihtiyacı yatıyordu."

the district from each fight with the state or all suffers because of cut heads."[127]

The passage, constructs an orientalist view on the Dersimis, who did not obey the Turkish Republic, in order to show its "sympathy" to those "poor" Dersimis and to purify the intent of the movements against them. Therefore, "interior reasons," as it is obvious, are deemed as the social structure and local and spiritual leaders of Dersim.

As the exterior reasons, Akyürekli, implies that the *Kürt Teali Cemiyeti* and *Hoybun* were supported by France that wanted to take advantage on the Hatay issue.[128] Besides that, Akyürekli adds that, although a member of Hoybun named İzzet,[129] who claimed to be France agent, was caught, there was not any evidence of the exterior effects on the Dersim issue. Regarding the letter which was sent to England under the sign of "The Dersim General Seyit Rıza" in French, Akyürekli adds that the all evidence shows that the author of this letter was Nuri Dersimi.[130] Therefore, it is possible to say that this kind of approach to the "Dersim events fits the two sided question that Bilmez recommends as arguments. In other words, this approach implies that, the discipline, punishment and banishment of Dersim occurred because of the "local attempts."[131]

---

[127]Ibid, 90. The original text is as following: "Bu sosyo kültürel kurumun Cumhuriyet için bir anda terk edilmesi çok da olası değildi. Yıllarca zor doğa şartlarına, yokluğa, kıtlığa karşı birlikte mücadele eden bu insanlar, yaşam mücadelesi adına hep beraber uğraş veriyorlardı. Acıları kederleri yasları birlikte yaşayıp paylaşan bu toplum devletle girilen çatışmalarda köye mezraya gelen her cenazenin veya kesilen her basin acısıyla irkiliyor ve etkileniyordu."

[128] In the novels of Baykara and Bilbaşar, this argument is emphasized very often.

[129] Barbaros Baykara's novel, Dersim 1937, introduces with the name 'izzettin' as a British agent and the protoganist Kemal Binbaşı by capturing him, 'destroys' the plans of Alişer and Besi who want to found 'Kurdistan'.

[130] The implication of Akyürekli, can be seen in the novel of Bilal Civelek named *Mustafa Kemal'in Kuşları Dersim Yanıyor*which signes Nuri Dersimi as an agent and the owner of this letter written by him with 'deceving' Seyit Rıza. In the novel, Seyit Rıza, at the closure, accepts that he was deceived by the Nuri Dersimi. The novel is analyzed in the third chapter.

[131] Some other sources, on the other hand, points that Seyit Rıza sent letters to many countries to inform about Dersim events. For example Kahraman does not exactly indicate who was the 'writer', he says that Seyit rıza have sent letters. In other word, Kahraman shows that Seyit Rıza had a role in the sending of letters whether

As a matter of fact, with the appointment of Abdullah Alpdoğan in 1936 to a position, similar to a "colonial governor,"[132]the preparations began. The inner conquest of Dersim, was planned by Alpdoğan as following:

> "The first mission of general inspectorship was to dominate Dersim. It was necessary to build roads and bridges in order to get inside Dersim and settle in it, and in order to prevent the burning the bridge, it was essential for them to be made from concrete. (...) It was required to build government offices, barracks in Dersim and also build the residences for the people who were in charge here. Together with those facilities, it was necessary to open dispensaries and schools and the people should be risen via their health and culture. On the other hand, in order to open a new age in the Dersim and in order to defeat/cope with the problems during the application of that program, it was necessary to give some judicial and executive authorization to the *vali* and commander."[133]

The cultural and military plans as s shown in the passage were prepared by the state. As a requirement of "modern" conquest of the Dersim, the state needed to register the Dersimis.[134] In that process, the state began to prevent the alliance among tribes and in some degree became successful in collecting guns. Yet, the Demenan, Heyderan, Kureyşan, Yusufan,

---

the handwriting belonged to him or not. Ahmet Kahrman. 2003. Kürt İsyanları Tedip ve Tenkil. İstanbul Evrensel. Pg 325.

[132]Bilmez, pg 29.

[133]Uluğ, Naşit Hakkı. 1939. *Tunceli Medeniyere Açılıyor,* İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Matbaası. . Pg 152. The original text is as following:"Genel müfettişliğin ilk vazifesi Dersim'e hâkim olmaktı. Dersim'in içine girip yerleşmek için yol ve köprü yaptırmak lazımdı; köprünün yakılmaması için de beton olması şarttı. (...) Dersim'in içinde hükümet konakları, kışlalar, karakollar kurmak ve bu bölgede, vazife göreceklerin ikametgahlarını da inşa icap ediyordu. Bu tesislerle beraber dispanseriler ve okullar açılmalı, sağlık ve kültür vasıtalarıyla halk yetiştirilmeliydı. Bir taraftan da Dersim'de yeni devir açmak ve bu programın tatbiki esnasında çıkabilecek müşkülatı yenmek için vali ve komutana bazı adli ve idari salahiyetler verilmek lazımdı."

[134] In the Bilbaşar's novels, that registration attampt is descibed as both damnification and a "good thin"' becouse of the military service. According to his novels Cemo, Memo 1-2, the state punish you both if you are registered already, in this case you become a "deserter" or if you are not registered, which means that you are a potantial "rebel". Bilbaşar critisizes this rough behaviours of the officers, but introduce registration as a "modern" aplication and a way to have the "chance" of being a soldier and "learn everything" from the barrracks.

Bahtiyar and Abasan tribes made an alliance, while the state was continuing the construction of roads, barracks, phone lines.

Dersim 1937

The massacre in "inner Dersim" occurred under these circumstances. The first step of Dersim movement, Dersim 1937, was aimed to liquidate the leaders of those six tribes who were expected to resist or think of resisting at that time. Seyit Rıza, who was already labeled by the state as the leader of that "rebellion" or "resistance" had an important effect on the alliance of those six tribes. The attacks to bridges, stations, roads etc. of the groups that were from those six tribes were actually aimed to prevent the progression of the state to inner Dersim. Yet, those unsystematic and non-central attacks were not capable of preventing both the air force and the well prepared army of the state, and also were becoming a pretext[135] for the state in order to legitimize the massacre in that region.[136]

With the admission of the Mustafa Kemal, İsmet İnönü and Fevzi Çakmak, the "resistance" of Dersimis towards the intervention of the state was labeled as a "rebellion" on the 4 May, 1937 by Council of Ministers. For realization of that decision "destruction of the villages" and "removal of the families" were considered as a necessity.[137] In other words, the *temdin* (civilizing) and *temsil* (assimilation) turned into "annihilation" when it comes to 1937.[138]

---

[135] Baykara's novels Dersim 1937, indicates the 'rebels' for he responsible of civil casualties and also adds that, even women was shooting to the soldiers and they were killed becouse of that.

[136] Bülent Bilmez. "Sözlü Tarih ve Belgesel Film Aracılığıyla Bir Kıyımla Yüzleşmek ve Hesaplaşmak" Özgür Fındık.2012. *Kara Vagon*. İstanbul:Fam. 31.

[137] Hallı, Reşat. 1972. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Ayaklanmalar. Ankara: Genelkurmay Basımevi. Pg 491.

[138] Gürboğa, Nurşen. 2011. "Erken Cumhuriyet Döneminde Devletin Dersim'le İmtihanı" *Toplumsal Tarih*, sayı 212 Ağustos 2011, pg. 25.

On the same dates, the Presidency of General Staff wanted to throw notification prepared also in Zazaki to the people from the planes[139].The notification text shows the orientalist view and the annihilation aim of the state very clearly stated as following:

> "To the people who are settling in the Lertik area in Ovacık district, Kalanlı people who settle in the areas of Mercan and Birman: You are learning the good things that the state is doing in Dersim in order to save the people from poverty and ignorance, every day. Some empty headed, tyrants who suspects those nice and beneficial things as dangerous for their benefits, perpetrate some crimes by deceiving some ignorant people via lies and slanders, made you shoot in Mansuluşağı village and other soldiersand take people's goods and sheep with force. Because of that crime, with forefending those ignorant people, they wanted to use the goods, the life of the poor people for their own pleasure and how they wanted. Because of that, the government, in order to stop the persecution of the tyrants and in order to save the innocent people from their hands and malignity, brought soldiers. As you see, you are besieged from all four sides and will start to move. Our aim is just to tame the criminals and especially the leaders."[140]

In that notification the basic arguments of the state are repeated such as 'ignorant people' and the 'cruel' local leaders. The thoughts and plans about Dersim, which was already turned to annihilation,[141] are introduced as the "good things" and the authorial eye in the text, in fact,

---

[139]Zeytinli, Murat. Zorunlu Göçler ve Türkiye'de Dersim 1938 Örneği. İstanbul Universty, 2012. Unpublished Dissertation.

[140]Hallı, Reşat. 1972. *Türkiye Cumhuriyetinde Ayaklanmalar* (1924–1938), Ankara: Genelkurmay Basımevi. EK-18. pg. 390–391. The original text is as following:"Ovacık Kazasının Lertik, Mercan ve Birman Mıntıkalarında Oturan Kalanlı Halka" başlıklı bildiri; "Halkı fukaralıktan ve cahillikten kurtarmak için hükümetin Tunceli'nde yapmakta olduğu iyi işleri her gün öğreniyorsunuz. Bu güzel ve hayırlı işleri kendi menfaatleri için zararlı sanan bazı boş kafalı zalimler, içinizden bir kısım cahilleri yalan ve iftiralarla kandırarak Mansuluşağı köyünde ve diğer askere tüfek sıkmak ve masum halkın mal ve davarlarını zorla almak gibi suçlar yaptırdılar. Bu suç yüzünden cahilleri hükümetten uzak bulundurmak suretiyle fakir fukaranın canını, ırzını ve malını kendi keyifleri için istedikleri gibi kullanmak istediler. Bu sebeple hükümet, zalimlerin zulümlerine son vermek ve masum halkı onların elinden ve şerrinden kurtarmak için asker getirmiş bulunuyor. Görüyorsunuz ki, dört tarafınızı asker sarmıştır ve harekete geçecektir. Maksadımız yalnız suçluları ve bilhassa elebaşılar uslandırmaktır."

[141]Hans-Lukas KIESER, Dersim Massacre, 1937-1938, Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence, [online], published on 27 July 2011, accessed 24 March 2015, URL: http://www.massviolence.org/Dersim-Massacre-1937-1938, ISSN 1961-9898. Pg 5.

pretended to be on the side of "poor" people but last sentences emphasizing that they are surrounded shows obviously that it is a threat. Therefore, looking to the attempt of the state announcing people directly even in their language, was not aimed to show "good intent" but to threaten them and to legitimize any civil casualty by presenting such types of "excitations."

As a matter of fact, the oral histories also show that, the state, without distinguishing guilty or non-guilty, killed people with bombardment and fusillades etc. With the hostility of the military towards Alevism the massacre was realized as a very "normal" process. In that process, the massacre found itself a place in the Turkish media as "Dersim movement" and became an object of the orientalist view of the state and a legitimization of the massacre, which depicted itself as the "peacemaker," "saver," "superior" and more "modern."[142] The "compassionate" state on one hand determined the content of the news, and on the other hand, continued its attacks towards Dersim and continued to kill its "targets." As a matter of fact, the state, surrounded and eradicated all of the targets and focused on finding the most important leaders, such as Seyit Rıza and Şahin.[143] The spiritual role of Seyit Rıza and the role of Şahin as a resister are very influential in both oral history studies on Dersim, and the novels written by the Dersimis.[144]

The reports which were sent to *Dâhiliye Vekâleti* (Interior Ministry) on 3 August, 1937 by the Dördüncü Umum Müfettişliğ (The fourth General Inspectorship), indicated that they had crossed the mountains which "opponents" trusted, went beyond the steep streams and scanned the most cunny caves.[145] In other words, the massacre which İsmet İnönü also watched during

---

[142] Baran, Taha.2014. 1937-1938 Tarihleri Arasında Basından Dersim. İstanbul: İletişim. Pg 41.

[143] Hallı, Reşat. 1972. Türkiye Cumhuriyetinde Ayaklanmalar (1924–1938), s. 405.

[144] Haydar Işık, Munzur Çem, Cafer Demir mentions about those leaders as symbols of the resistance both as theorotical and resisters.

[145] Başbakanlık Cumhuriyet Arşivi, 030-10-..-..-111-745-16. Cited from Zeytinli, Murat. Zorunlu Göçler ve Türkiye'de Dersim 1938 Örneği. İstanbul Universty, 2012. Unpublished Dissertation.

his visit to Elazığ on 18 June, 1937 the state without looking the age, the gender, even the people who left their villages and hid into the caves, killed or exiled them.

As one of the leaders of the resistance and symbols Alişer, who was also a bard and poet,[146] was killed by Rehber[147], the niece of Seyit Rıza with his wife Zarife were also killed on 9 July, 1937. As one of the resister who was very close to Seyit Riza, the killing of Alişer by a Dersimi, left a huge influence on the collective memory of Dersim.[148] Şahin from the Bahtiyaran tribe, who was also an influential figure of the resistance, was also killed by Hıdır, a tribe member, on 26 August, 1937.[149] As a matter of fact, Seyit Rıza, after those events and a long escaping process on the 10 September, 1937, according to some sources, had to surrender to the state. According to others, he was caught while he was trying to leave the region over Erzincan, or was trapped while he was going to meet with the governors for peace.[150] The seizure of Seyit Rıza, was announced from the headline of the newspapers in 13-14-15 September, 1937 such as *Ulus*, *Tan, Kurum*. According to these newspapers the "the most influential and the last leader of Dersim" and "the head of the "boil", Seyit Rıza was captured.[151] After his seizure, Mustafa Kemal, İsmet İnönönü, Şükrü Kaya and Kazım Orbay sent congratulatory address to Abdullah Alpdoğan, and the capturing of the leaders of the "rebellion" was named as a "historic success."[152]

Seyit Rıza was brought to Elazığ and was trialed with some other Dersimi leaders by a special court martial. The court was actually extrajudicial, and after turning the age of Seyit Rıza

---

[146] Dersimi, Nuri. Hatıratım. Pg 176

[147] Munzur Çem's novel Gülümse Ey Dersim indicates Zeynel, the other niece of Seyit Rıza, as the murderer. Yet, the responsible, the provoker, 'the evil' is Rehber who deceived Zeynel by saying him if Alişer is killed, the state will make peace. As a matter of fact, after that, Zeynel goes back to resistance with a great regret and die during the resistance according to novel.

[148] Even Kemal Bilbaşar, with changing the names/posisiton of characters uses the death of ALişer and Zarife by Rehber in *Memo 2* as a dramatic scene.

[149] In the Munzur Çem's novel, Gülümse Ey Dersim, 'The son of Pırço, Hıdır' kills him with encourage of the money that state promises and the personal jealousy.

[150] For example, in the Munzur Çem's novel, Gülümse Ey Dersim, this event told as following: "Go. Seyit Rıza was captured. The saints left the Dersim" pg 237. Ahmet Kahraman also refuse the 'surrender claims' and points that Seyit Rıza was going to make peace meeting but he trapped. Kahraman, 2003. Pg 330

[151] Baran, Taha. 2014. Basında Dersim. İstanbul: İletişim. "Dönemin Gazetelerinden Seçmeler" Pg 197-242.

[152] Akyürekli, 2011. Pg 139.

from 78 to 54, he was condemned to death. His son, Resik Hüseyin, who was injured and convinced by Rehber that the state promised to cure him in a hospital in Elazığ, was also jailed in order to be executed. As a matter of fact, after tuning his age from 17 to 21, he was condemned to death with his father.

At the Sunday night of 14 November, 1937, when Atatürk was in the break at Elazığ Yolçatı, during his journey to Diyarbakır, the precipitately the trial was held and Seyit Rıza was executed with his son and the other four leaders on the *Elazığ Buğday Meydanı*. The aftermath of the body of Seyit Rıza, despite the effort that his grandsons spent and the judiciary attempt, is still hidden as a state secret.[153] After the executions, Dersim, according to newspapers, was imbedded in history.[154]

Dersim 1938

An official document from 11 May 1937, of which the writer is not known, actually presents the next step of the state, which can be called as "massacre."[155]As a matter of fact, the writer of the document recommended that, it was important to not leave the places where reforms entered and gave detailed steps for completing disciplining of Dersim. In the end of the text, the writer adds that since the state decided to "reform of Dersim" it is important to not neglect the social, geographic fight tactic of Dersim in order to be successful. That, therefore, can be counted as preparations" for the mass violence of Dersim 1938. In other words, although the state decelerated to stop movement after capturing the leaders, that was not the intent of the state as stated obviously in that report.

As a matter of fact, after decelerating the end of the Dersim movement, under the leadership of the first operation, İsmet İnönü, the preparation was continued by Celal Bayar. The opening

[153]Bilmez, Bülent. "Sözlü Tarih ve Belgesel Aracılığıyla Bir Kıyımla Yüzleşmek ve Hesaplaşmak." İn Özgür Fındık.2012. Kara Vagon. İstanbul: Fam.

[154]*Cumhuriyet,* 18 Kasım 1937.

[155]Yıldırım, Tuğba. 2011. *Kürt Sorunu ve Devlet: Tedip ve Tenkil Politikaları.* İstanbul:Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları. Pg 97-103. The Fon Code of the document: NSS, Seri No: 03, Dosya No: 22, Belge No: 200.

speech of Celal Bayar at the opening of the parliament indicated the continuity of the movement as following:

> "In terms of internal issues, there is a topic, which is very necessary to mention to you, and that is the Dersim issue. We have a reform program in Dersim, and this program is operating. By means of construction of road, bridge and school, last year military movement was done. That is known by everybody with all of its details. This year, more forces are gotten together here, with regard to last year, in some places some small collisions happened. There is one more precaution that we will take in order to liquidate the issue, which is a requirement for the program that we are enforcing to Dersim. Soon, our army will make military maneuvers to the Dersim region. In this connection, our army will take position for Dersim, and with general scanning supporting the disciplinary forces, we will eradicate that issue from its root."[156]

The assimilation and eradication policies of the state are very obvious in that text. The state instruments which opened the way of entering to inner Dersim and the "bloodbath" that had committed until that date were not found to be sufficient, and the last "precaution" that the state planned to take was obviously the "massacre." As the frame of that speech, the preparation for the new military movement was implemented for the spring of next year--1938.

Even a guidebook was prepared in Elazığ *Turan* printing house by *Tunceli Vali ve Kumandanlığı* (Tunceli governor and command) which included every detail of "disciplining"

[156] 29 Haziran 1938 tarihli Meclis Zabıtları, 5. Devre, Cilt 26, s. 507. The original text is as following: "Bu senenin dahili işleri noktayı nazarından size ehemmiyetle bahsetmeğe değer bir mevzu vardır, o da Dersim meselesidir. Dersim'de bir ıslahat programımız vardır, bu program yürümektedir. Yol, köprü ve mektep inşası suretiyle geçen sene askeri harekât yapıldı. Bu, bütün teferruatıyla herkesin malumudur. Bu sene de programa göre askeri harekâtın geçen seneye nazaran, burada bu sene daha fazla kuvvetlerimiz toplanmıştır, birkaç yerde ufak tefek müsademeler olmuştur. Dersim için tatbik ettiğimiz programın icabı olarak bu meseleyi sureti katiyede tasfiye etmek için alacağımız bir tedbir daha vardır. Yakında ordumuz Dersim havalisinde manevralar yapacaktır. Bu münasebetle ordumuz Dersim için vazife alacak ve umumi bir tarama hareketi ile tedip kuvvetlerine destek olaraktan, bu meseleyi kökünden söküp atacaktır

Dersim.[157] With the operation of the Fourth General Inspectorship the maneuver of the Third Army was decided to be operated in Dersim too. The Turkish Air Force which was very "effective" in the 1937 movement, was also prepared for the 1938 maneuver at Elazig. There were two stages of the 1938 massacre: first,--the operation of units allied to the Fourth Army Inspectorship from June to August, and second--the "cleaning" movement of the Third Army units from August to November.

The first stage aimed to enter Inner Dersim which was not received yet, and the 'remaining' of the 1937 movement was to extirpate.

The Third Army would come to the region, according to the plan, and according to Hallı, the army would "find the chance of the fight with a living target" for the first time.[158] The 1938 Movement seemed to be a more massive ethnic cleaning which included the tribes or people, who had not participated with the 1937 resistance, and also the tribes/people, who had actually supported/cooperated with the state. As the oral history studies also reveals in 1938, the state tried to eradicate, especially with "contributions" of the Turkish Air force [159] and toxic gas used to kill the people in caves[160], anything alive in Dersim. By throwing people from the cliffs, burning people in caves, killing with toxic gasses, spitting with guns to not "waste" bullets were some of the key killing methods of the state, which influenced the Dersim collective memory and the Dersim literature, specifically the novels. *The Lost Girls of*

---

[157] The information about the guidline is availeble in following link and with a footnote: http://www.bianet.org/bianet/toplum/118252-dersim-de-1937-1938-de-ne-oldu? Footnote: "Nokta Dergisinin 28 Haziran 1987 tarihli yıl 5, sayı 25'te "Dersim 1937-1938/ Yarım Yüzyıl Sonra" başlıklı dosyası Ayşenur Arslan,Hıdır Göktaş, Nadire Mater,Mahmut Övür ve Seral Özzeybekimzalarını taşıyor." The access date: 24.03.2015

[158] Hallı, Reşat.1972. *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Ayaklanmalar*. Ankara: Genelkurmay Basımevi. Pg 415.

[159] Olson, Robert. (2000). "The Kurdish rebellions of Sheikh Said (1925), Mt. Ararat (1930), and Dersim (1937-8): Their impact on the development of the Turkish Air Force and on Kurdish and Turkish nationalism". *Welt des Islams, 40*(1), 67-94. The article indicates that the Turkish Air Force strengthened its power after Dersim movements.

[160] Radikal, 04.12.2013. http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/dersim_katliaminda_kimyasal_izi_ilk_kez_ortaya_cikti-1164486. The access date: 23 march 2015.

Dersim[161] became the protagonists of the novels on Dersim which actually aim to "keep the memory alive."[162]That massacre left very traumatic memories and soon after the end of the operations, Dersimis, from the restricted and unrestricted areas, were sent to exile using "black wagons."[163]

On the other hand, although they were diminished, the massacres proceeds until 1941. Because of the "forbidden zone" applications people continued to live in caves and mountains for a very long time.[164]

The exile process and the state policy aimed to diverge Dersimis and in some cases to separate from each other. In exile, besides the "reactions" of local people who "knew" Dersimis from the media, which introduced as "wilds," "robbers," "rebels," and also had prejudices because of their Alevism[165], the state was also keeping them under surveillance[166]. After the repentance law, the returns of Dersim, which was "eradicated," and "reformed" by the destruction of the all features of Dersim, the turning process also seemed to be hard like the exile itself.[167]

---

[161] GÜndoğdu, Nezahat ve Kaızm Gündoğdu. 2012. *Dersim'in Kayıp Kızlar*. İstanbul: İletişim.

[162] Ali Arslan's novel named *Serçe* was published in 1988 by Sistem publishing as the first novel written until that date which mentions about Dersim as a massacre and a growing up story of a girl who lost some part of her family and exiled with his brother. The novel, focuses the exile process of the Serçe and the socio-economic atmosphere of the Turkey at that period. Also, the novel of Oya Baydar, *O Muhteşem Hayatınız*, is about a total 'loss' girl, who grows up as a child of an officer and became a famous opera singer. In a very old age she and her daughter Arya, learn that they are actually from Dersim and they 'faces' with their pasts. In the novel, the 'memoris' the 'unconscious mind' about Dersim is metaphorically told by the inner voices/images in the mind of the protagonist. The novel with those technics, and the confrontation theme, implies that, the trauma of Dersim 1938, , cannot be cleaned from the memories of the witnesses and the confrontation is a necessity.

[163] Fındık, Özgür. 2012. *Kara Vagon*. İstanbul Fam. The People was carried to exile by the goods wagons. Including that book, it is possible to find the trumatic memories of that process in Cafer Demir's novel Umudu Ve Turukusuyla Qopo and Munzur Çem's novel Gülümse Ey Dersim.

[164] Bülent Bilmez. "Sözlü Tarih ve Belgesel Film Aracılığıyla Bir Kıyımla Yüzleşmek ve Hesaplaşmak" Özgür Fındık.2012. *Kara Vagon*. İstanbul:Fam. Pg 34.

[165]For example, in the novel of Cafer Demir named Umudu ve Tutkusuyla Qopo, ıin the exile, only an Armenian family behaves well to him and his family. On the other hand, in the Mustafa Yeşilova's novel Kopo, the helper is the 'Republican luminary' the teacher of the village, the other people who persecutes Kopo and his family, introduces as the 'ottoman remaining'.

[166] Even the Kemalist biased novel Kopo written by Mustafa Yeşilova, mentions about these problems, but indicates the 'reactionist' people or the feudal leaders as the guilty of that problems.

[167] The novel of Haydar Karataş, named *Gece Kelebeği* gives a small piece of the atmosphere after the turning of exile. Pg 249. Karataş, Haydar. 2010. Gece Kelebeği-Perperik-a Söe. İstanbul: İletişim.

It is necessary to add that, there are enough sources to "convince" about what happened in Dersim. Even in the literature, which displays Dersim 1937-38 as "rebellion" of local leaders in order to not lose their power, adds that the mass violence happened there. Also, it is important to add that, introducing state as the "protagonist" of the Dersim 1937-38 that killed people without confronting any "rebel/resistance" is also not real and constructs a self-orientalism by objectifying Dersimis. As a matter of fact, besides the flow of events that happened in Dersim in 1937-38, "discourses" on Dersim are also important searching area to find different dynamics of different point of views.

The novels that are analyzed in the following chapter show the orientalist discourse of the "colonizer" state in first part and aim to legitimize the Dersim movement. In the second part, novels at some point derive from the discourse of the first part's novels.

Orientalism towards Dersim

The first sentence of Ussama Makdisi written in "Ottoman Orientalism" is very striking in order to understand the orientalist approach of the Ottoman state during late Ottoman period and the approach of the young Turkish Republic to the Dersim region like the other parts of Kurdistan: "In an age of western-dominated modernity every nation creates its own orient."[168] The last century of the Ottoman Empire the young Republic, was basically one of those "nations" that established a community based on a "western dominated modernization."

With modernization, the nomads/mountain peasants were perceived as "savages," sometimes "noble" but always in need to be civilized. The approach to the Dersim region and to the Dersim people, was exactly a part/an object of the "orient" creation processes in the Ottoman modernization period." The state and its military and civil bureaucrats attributed themselves

[168] Maksidi, ussama. Ottoman orientalism pg 768.

the mission of civilizing the Dersim people, who "resembled the wild African tribes."[169] Because of that viewpoint, the Ottoman elites with their colonial position would associate the Dersim local people with the terminologies *şaki* (robber), *göçebe* (nomad) and *rafz u ilhad* (stray and perversion), with which they would legitimize the intervention to the region.[170] The region was imagined as a colony, and therefore, the movements against the Dersim were a part of Ottoman centralization politics can be called "Ottoman colonization," which aimed to assimilation of Dersim by the state institutions.

The state with modern methods, which required cultural involvement, began to "colonize" the region. *Aşiret Mektepleri*[171] (schools of Tribe), constructions barracks and road were the steps of the process. According to Selçuk Akşin Somel, the aim of this school was to Ottomanize the children of the tribes and make them loyal to the Ottoman state.[172] The main concern of state was to have control over the tribes.[173] It is no coincidence that Baskın Oran compares that school to the schools opened in Africa by the British, who also accepted the leaders of African tribes.[174] The state saw the people who knew some Turkish as "the potential subservient." It was obvious that the state was aware of the "miracle" of the language which could be the key in the obedience of the region. Thus, the governors in the region classified the people according to their language, and after the foundation of *Hamidiye Alayları,* the participation of the regiments.

Hamidiye Alayları, built as a Sunni group like *Aşiret Mektepleri*, aimed to remove the social structure of the region.The state, by providing some superiority to members of *Hamidiye*

---

[169]Cihangir Gündoğdu ve Vural Genç. 2013. *Dersim'de Osmanlı Siyaseti*. İstanbul: Kitapyayınevi, pg.53

[170]Ibid. Pg 52-53.

[171]*Aşiret Mektepleri was built in 1892 which had a unique character. This school was established for the education of influential tribes' children. The school was closed in 1907.* For further*reading:* Alişan Akpınar. 2002. *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Aşiret Mektepleri*. İstanbul: Aram.

[172] Somel, Selçuk Akşin. *Modern Muslim Education in İstanbul During the Tanzimat Era*.http://research.sabanciuniv.edu/21970/1/Muslim_Education_inIstanbul_during_the_Tanzimat_Era_Somel.pdfAccess date: 13.01.2015.

[173] Brunessen, Martin Van. 2003. *Ağa, Şeyh ve Devlet*. Çev. Banu Yalkut. İstanbul: İletişim.

[174] Oran, Baskın. "Kürt Milliyetçiliğinin Diyaleği" *in Modern Türkiye'de siyasi düşünceler* Cilt 4 Milliyetçilik. 874

Alayları, paved the way of chaos and maladjustment in the region, which supposed to destroy the local system and adapt the region to the state system. Also, the state had a secondary classification of the people/tribes in the region, which was supposed to make the "civilization" movements easier.

İbrahim Yılmazçelik's consideration of these steps of state regards the state behavior as maintaining order of the region via peace with the tribes.[175] The reports mention "cultural changing" in a way to make the Yılmazçelik argument as a defense or as a legitimization of the state's politics towards the region from the Ottoman period to Republic. As a matter of fact, the operation between 1894-1896 to Armenian people and the Islamization policies in the domains of the empire show that the aim of the state was to build a fresh state, which was supposed to consist of Sunni Muslim *tebaa* (citizens)[176] and did not include the different religions or even religious sects. The integration of the "uncivilized" of Dersim with being Qızılbash, which was supposed to handily cooperate with the "enemies" such as the Shiites or Armenians, makes the region eerie in the perception of the state. In order to be given to the poor children of Dersim for free, bringing The Quran to the region were also part of the efforts of the state to change the cultural texture of Dersim and the Sunnification of the state.

The language of the official reports, newspaper and literal works from the very beginning of the Dersim movements until today still uses the orientalist discourse. The novels of Kemal Bilbaşar, Barbaros Baykara, Mustafa Yeşilova and Bilal Civelek, which are evaluated in fourth chapter, are some literal work examples of that orientalist discourse.

That orientalist discourse of state and the novels written for reproducing that approach, on the other hand, also influenced the language of the "oppressed," the "victims" of Dersim 1937-38,

---

[175] Yılmazçelik, İbrahim. Dersim Sancağının Kırılmasından Sonra Karşılaşılan Güçlükler ve Dersim Sancağı ile İlgili Bu Dönemde Yazılan Raporlar (1875-1918) OTAM(Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi)Sayı: 28 Sayfa: 163-214 Yayın Tarihi: 2010--

[176] Bozarslan, Hamit. *Türkiye'nin Modern Tarihi*.İstanbul: Avesta, 2004. Pg 20.

in the novels. Partha Chatterjee indicates that the nationalism in the colonized world is reverse version of the colonizer's nationalist/orientalist discourse.[177] According to Chatterjee, the problem with nationalism of the oppressed is being the exact opposite of the orientalism, and in other words, the subject in mind still carries the essentialist character of the eastern.

Haydar Işık, Munzur Çem, Cafer Demir's novels which are analyzed in the fourth chapter, in that context, can be evaluated as examples of the "derivative discourse," which Chatterjee recommends. The orientalist discourse on Dersim and specifically Dersim 37-38, which was constructed via history writing, literature, especially novels-, etc. had influenced the Dersimi writers who were a part of that identity. The sources of their "narrations" were basically witnesses of Dersim 1937-38 and the non-canonical history sources. Therefore, their works were not able to escape the influence of the orientalist discourse. Although those writers were ideologically entirely in different paths, they used similar discourses/methods in their novels in order to tell the "tragedy" of Dersim 1937-1938. Being the "vice version" of the orientalist discourse, the language of the oppressed, therefore, stays in the same frame with the orientalist discourse. The savageness/wildness, the necessity of "modernity" are repeated in those writers' novels.

CHAPTER III:

Turkish Novelson Dersim 1937-1938: An Overview

Overview

Dersim in 1937-1938 and the process before and after the massacres, has influenced the literature beginning with 1960s. Beginning with Kemal Bilbaşar three novels on Dersim 1937-1938, Barbaros Baykara wrote directly referring to the 1937-1938 massacres his novels

[177]Chatterjee, Partha.1995.Nationalist Thought and The Colonial World. London, U.K: Zed Books. Pg. 77-78.

Dersim 1937 and *Tunceli 1938*. Following Baykara's novel, Mustafa Yeşilova's novel *Kopo*, was published in 1977.

Between 1960- 1980, Dersim 1937-38 events were written with similar arguments which targeted the social structure of Dersim, responsible for the events, and aimed to legitimize the massacre/purification by the "republic" by highlighting the "wild nature" of Dersimis, who resisted in becoming civilized by the "merciful" state. Yet, at the end of 1980s, a Marxist writer, Ali Arslan without focusing directly on 1937-1938 defined Dersim 1937-38 as a very traumatic massacre for the first time including "awareness" of the situation of Kurds in Turkey. Naming Dersim events as a massacre and evaluating it as a part of the Kurdish issue in Turkey the novel *Serçe* became a breaking point. Beginning with of 1990s, Munzur Çem and Haydar Işık, wrote novels on Dersim 1937-38 in order to redefine Dersim events as massacre. The novel of Muzaffer Oruçoğlu *Dersim*, on the contrary to Dersim novels that had been written up until that time, introduced Dersim 1937-38 by focusing on an antihero in an ironic way, which put the novel in a marginal position even among the "marginal" novels which defined Dersim 1937-38 as a massacre in terms of the official discourse. As a matter of fact, in the beginning of 2000s, besides two novels of Metin Aktaş *Sürgün* and *Acı Fırat Asi Fırat*[178] on Dersim 1937-38, Cafer Demir's novels also proceeded the writing of Dersim novels with the same aim of Işık and Çem.

The novels above, in other words, represent a certain disposition either defining Dersim 1937-38 as a massacre or a "rebellion of feudal leaders." Both discourses depict Dersimis as ignorant/unconscious, religiously manipulated and in need to be emancipated. The objects and subjects change but the main discourse can be followed throughout the each novels.

[178] Aktaş, Metin.1993. *Acı Fırat Asi Fırat*. İstanbul: Tümda-Yön

With the Sevim Anagür's novel named *Yüzünde Bir Yer* published in 2007 the "Dersim Novels" had a metamorphosis in terms of literary aspects and discursive structure. The novel of Anagür can be accepted as a breaking point in the new canon of Dersim novels. Rejecting the discourse of legitimization of the 1937-38 massacre, Çem, Demir, Işık construct Dersim by rewriting/correcting those novels' argument. Yet, beginning with Anagür's novel, the experience, the trauma, wounds of the massacre begin to be the focus of the novels, while the previous approach proceeded differently. Change of discourse does not mean that the novels became free of the "intent," yet, with narrative methods, the subjects of Dersim 1937-38 regained their subjectivity.

Beginning with 2010 the number of Dersim novels increased very rapidly. From 2010-15 thirteen novels have been written on Dersim 1937-1938 covering different aspects. This increment seems to be the product of the confrontation with Dersim in years with documentaries, both personal and nonprofessional oral history studies, which have been published in periodicals as interviews or as books by Dersimis.[179]

On the one hand, the new approach to Dersim, which consists of the character, who has their free will, act/struggle/betray etc., continues with Haydar Karataş's novel *Gece Kelebeği Perperik-a Soe* Celal Yıldız's novel *Dersim Dile Geldi* and Remzi Aydın's novel *Sahipsiz Çığlıklar Roé Dersim.* Yıldız's novel, as a document-novel, focuses on the memories of the people who were children in 1938. On the other hand, Aydın's novel *Sahipsiz Çığlıklar* and *Toprak Dile Geldi* depict the religious aspect of Dersim by carrying the memory of 1937-38. The short stories written by different writers, compiled in a book, *Bir Dersim Hikayesi* by Murathan Mungan, and Oya Baydar's novel *O Muhteşem Hayatınız* open the doors of confrontation with the Dersim Massacre on a fictional level.

---

[179] Bilmez, Bülent. "Sözlü Tarih ve Film Belgeselciliği Aracılığıyla Bir Kıyımla Yüzleşmek ve Hesaplaşmak" in Özgür Fındık.2012. Kara Vagon. İstanbul: Fam. Pg. 18.

Besides the dominating atmosphere of Dersim Novels in 2010s, Bilial Civelek's novel *Mustafa Kemal'in Kuşları Dersim Yanıyor*, and Yılmaz Akbulut's novel *Dersim'in Dikeni*, reproduce the arguments of Baykara's novel as a response to other novels/discourses which force the state and people to confront the Dersim massacre. The last novel published in 2015, as a matter of fact, *Vagon*[180] by İsmail Taylan Kaya again through exile focuses on the Dersim massacre.

Out of the Dersim novels: An overview of non-fiction

After an overview on Dersim literature, beginning with Kemal Bilbaşar novel *Cemo*, it is necessary to look at the discursive entity of Dersim novels which can be evaluated with the non-textual discursive area.

The literature atmosphere of 1960s, which was defined as social realistic, aimed to look at Anatolia and solve the problem of the peasantry in the binary oppositions such as oppressor-oppressed, innocent people-cruel agha, the good -the evil.[181] According to Moran, those new approaches in literature, do not reproduce state ideology but look at the society from the outside and he considers Yaşar Kemal, Orhan Kemal, Fakir Baykurt and Kemal Bilbaşar to be pioneers.

Moran conceptualizes the "noble savage/primitive" characters of literature by borrowing them from western literature, specifically from J.J. Rousseau. According to him, the noble savages, who do not have the "evil" of civilization, which was constructed upon the fairness/benefit/hypocrisy and the prosperity of the rich, are the real "natural human beings".[182] Hobsbawm similarly, draws a bandit type, who has some characteristics such as securing justice, taking from the rich and giving to the poor, or not being an enemy of the

[180] Kaya, İsmail Taylan. 2015. *Vagon*. İstanbul: Dersim Yayınları
[181] Moran, Berna. 2009. *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış*. İstanbul: İletişim pg 21-22.
[182] İbid, 31.

king/emperor.[183] This frame, according to Moran, is coherent with socialist-realistic novels of Turkish literature including the novels of Bilbaşar, which can be counted as the canonical novels of Turkish Literature.

As a matter of fact, Bilbaşar, with his novels *Cemo, Memo1- Memo2*[184]reconstructed the "noble savage" under the influence of Dersim 1937-1938. The novel, published from Evren Yayınları which was a canonical[185] publishing house, took the *Türk Dil Kurumu Roman Ödülü* (Turkish Language Society Novel Award) in 1966. Bilbaşar, who graduated from *Edirne Öğretmen Okulu* (Edirne Teacher School) and *Gazi Eğitim Enstitüsü,* (Gazi EducationInstitute) positions himself as one of the "luminaries" of the Republic, which can be followed from the novels throughout the representative characters.[186]

Cemo which can be counted as the first novel of "Dersim literature" after Dersim 1937-38, with the continuing novels *Memo 1-2*, has two introduction articles that can be perceived as a defence and explanation of the novels. The first article entitled "Romanın Yazarı Kendini Tanıtıyor" (The writer of novel introduces himself) written by Bilbaşar, and the second one is written by Tahir Alangu named "Edebiyat Tarihçisi Cemo'yu Anlatıyor" (The literature historian tells the Cemo). Those articles give a wider area to analyse the text itself and to understand the function of the "noble savage" type in the novels of Bilbaşar, which are actually constructed as a part of "civilization" discourse.

---

[183] Hobsbowm, E.J. 1972.*Bandits*. Pelican Books, pg 42-43.

[184] Bilbaşar, Kemal. *Memo 1-2*. İstanbul: Tekin

[185]The alternative publish house, at that period were generally publishing the Marxist literatüre.Evren Yayıncılık, was not one of them, therefore, including Tekin Yayınevi, which published the second edition of Cemo, the novels of Bilbaşar can be counted as the canonical novels which is also one of the novels that listed as '100 Temel Eser' (100 Basic Works) in the Turkish National Education Ministry. That list, obviously can be counted as the list of literary Works that the stat both reccomend and allow the student to read.

[186] The author shows himself throughout the 'luminary' characters in the novels, such as Memo's commander or the other 'educated' people who struggle with the 'enemy' of Republic and support the people.

In the first article Bilbaşar not only gives his background, but his thoughts and desires about Dersim, which make the article both a part of fiction and a wider discursive area related to the political/historical position of Dersim events:

> With perceiving the interest that Cemo took as a sign of awakening of those people who groan under the cruelty of the agha, I become happier. I will feel much more happiness, when I see my people protect their constitutional rights, the radical reforms done in my country, and Cemos, Memos, Fadiks, Usens reach the liberated life that they deserved.[187]

The article, which is not a part of the novel, indicates a frame about Dersim: the local people are suffering from the local powers and they should be rescued. On the other hand, the author, puts himself as an "luminary" that "guides" people. Also, with using the locality of the people, according to author, it will be easier to persuade people read his book, empower the "national" part of him and make it easier to reach his audience .[188] As a "Republican luminary" Bilbaşar is appreciated by the critics for being the "voice" of the "silent slaves" of the east with *Cemo*. Tahir Alangu's introduction article "Edebiyat Tarihçisi Cemo'yu Anlatıyor" is one of those critics of the novel and Dersim/Dersimis. The article, instead of focusing the literary values of the novel, evaluates it by reproducing the dominant discourse on Dersim. The picture which is drawn in Bilbaşar's article, in other words, becomes clearer as following:

> With the particular qualities that the stiff nature conditions give people, the ceremonies that are based on the ruins of ancient ages cultures, life orders which linked the feudal ruins, and his narration which represents the old

[187]Bilbaşar, Kemal. 1966. Cemo. İstanbul: Tekin. pg 7. The original text is the following: " Cemo'nun gördüğü ilgiyi, ağa zulmü altında inleyenlerin uyanışına bir işaret sayarak daha da seviniyorum. En büyük sevinci halkımın anayasa haklarına sahip çıktığını, yurdumuzda köklü reformların yapıldığını, Cemoların, Memoların, Fadiklerin, Üsenlerin layık oldukları özgür yaşayışa kavuştuklarını gördüğüm zaman yaşayacağım."

[188]Bilbaşar, Cemo Pg 6. The original text is as following: "Eserlerimde meddah taklitlerine, halk masal ve hikâye deyişlerine de yer veriyorum. Bununla eserimi halkıma daha rahat okutacağım,"

> mitoses atmosphere that create legends, this work reveals a trial which was unprecedented among us until now."[189]

The unmentioned, avoided points in Bilbaşar's article come onto the surface with Alangu's article. The identity of "the people" becomes visible, which actually refers to the eastern peoples of Turkey, Kurds, specifically Dersimis. According to the author, the Dersimis have some "particular" qualities. The word "particular" both shows and hides the orientalist attitudes that regard Dersimis as primitive "savages." The words "feudal", "feudal ruins", "ancient ages" that the author connects to Dersim, and the Dersimis clarify two main points: Firstly, by blaming the feudality, the text legitimizes the military movements towards Dersim, which were supposed to aim to rescue the Dersimis from hands of "feudal" lives, and secondly, by attributing an antiquity/ primitivism to Dersim, it gives the clues of the orientalist approach towards Dersim. The following quotation brings the points one step further, makes the intent of the text clearer and revels hidden aspects of the first one:

> "the works while presenting the drama of the people with all sad aspects, who rub along in an atmosphere that maintains, bring the life conditions of the primitive societies that are far from the state and the humanistic civilization, and at the same time the binding of the foundation of novel to the local narration of the novel puts "Cemo" in a more attractive and interesting position."[190]

According to Alangu, as a primitive far out of state, and unreached by humanity and civilization, Dersim is in a "touching" position. Also the locality in the novel, makes the novel interesting, according to the Alangu, which means it is possible to hear the voices of those

---

[189] Ibid pg 8. The original text is as following: "Çetin tabiat şartlarının insanlara verdiği farklı tabiat özellikleri, eski çağlar kültürünün kalıntılarına dayanan törenlerini, feodal kalıntılara bağlanan feodal yaşama düzenlerini, lejantları yaratan o eski mitos havasını yansıtan anlatımı ile bizde şimdiye kadar benzeri görülmeyen bir denemeyi ortaya koyuyor bu eser."

[190] Ibid, pg 9. The Original text is as following: "Devletten ve insancıl uygarlıktan uzak, o eski ilkel toplumların yaşama şartlarını sürdürüp götüren bir ortamda yuvarlanıp giden insanların dramlarını bütün acıklı yönleriyle ortaya koyarken, eserin kuruluşunun yerli anlatım tekniğine bağlanması, 'Cemo' romanını daha çekici ve ilginç bir duruma getirmiştir."

"odd" and "primitive" people. The emphasis of distance between Dersim and the state gives both space to orientalise the "other" and blame the ignorance of people for the "bad events" in Dersim 37-38.

The introduction articles of the novel, by penetrating the novels fictional area with the "reality" of the introduction, make each text related with integrity, which cannot be separated from each other. The speech of Bilbaşar on his novels also completes that discursive entity. He indicates that he wrote in Eastern Anatolia, which was ensanguined by the "interior and exterior lechers". [191]

Therefore, the mission of Bilbaşar as a "Republican Luminary," in that context, is to legitimate the Dersim Massacre via novels. The protagonist of his novels, Memo, in other words, is not actually "local" person, but he represent the "noble savage" idea of Bilbaşar, who is proper to be a "republican" if he is educated/disciplined, which is coherent to the desire of the official discourse. As a matter of fact, Baykara takes that mission after Bilbaşar with his two volume novels *Dersim 37*, *Tumceli 38.* The desire of Bilbaşar becomes real in the second novel of Baykara: The "savage Dersim" becomes "civilized Tunceli" with the massacre in 1938.

Dersim 1937[192] was published in 1974 by Akyar Yayıncılık under the title of documentary novel series. That title, actually shows the position that the writer and publisher took in the novel. As a matter of fact, the "prologue" of the novel under the sign of Akyar Yayıncılık indicates the intent of the novel and underlines the "reality" of the fiction. According to the introduction, Baykara's novels are generally about social events in history, and logically, this novel *Dersim 1937* focuses on the "Seyit Rıza Rebellion." The publishing house, in other words, defines Dersim 1937-1938 as a rebellion of a person and according to the publishing

[191] "Kemal Bilbaşar ile Konuşma", *Yeni Ortam*, 11 Kasım 1972.
[192] Baykara, Barbaros. 1974. *Dersim 1937.* Ankara: Akyar.

house, Baykara in that novel focuses on internal-external reasons of the rebellion and especially on the snares that are set for the young Turkish Republic. This point of view is supported with the following lines: "The writer before starting writing that work, researched newspapers from 1937 one by one and he determined the detail of the transmission of the events."[193]The evidence of the truthfulness of the novel is proven by the newspaper research. The writer, according to that quotation, does fabricate the events but with the help of the reality which he found in newspapers writes facts about Dersim 1937 events. The publishing house promises "reality" to the addressee/reader with that explanation. Also, according to the text, the character Besi is written with the inspiration of a newspaper article published in *Cumhuriyet* in the September of 1937. The description of Besi, the wife of Seyit Rıza, is also a part convincing the reader about truthfulness of the events. According to text, Besi who had an authority over Seyit Rıza and the other Dersim tribes, is one of the most colourful characters of the novel. Yet, according to the text, this powerful female figure is actually "evil": "A female who is both very beautiful and attractive and a very good shooter and blood drinker ... feeding her ideas about the foundation of independent Kurdistan with her acts, it is proven that she is also a fanatic Alevi."[194]That description of Besi, includes a curious desire towards to Besi and an east note in her character, and the "savageness" wildness emphasizes the western image of the Dersim. The distinction between womanhood and femininity shows the disparity of the thoughts about Dersim and Dersimis. The wildness which is represented as "femininity" tries to be depicted as lower than "womanhood," which objectifies Besi. In other

---

[193]İbid, 5. The original text is as following: "Yazar bu eserine başlamadan önce 1937 tarihli gazeteleri tek tek incelemiş ve bu tarihteki gazetelerin olayları verişlerindeki ayrıntıları tespit etmiştir."

[194]İbid, 5. The original text is as following: "Çok güzel ve çekici bir kadın olduğu kadar güzel silah kullanan ve kan içici bir dişi.. Bağımsız Kürt devleti kurulması yönündeki fikirlerini eylemlerle besleyen bu kadının bir fanatik alevi olduğu da kanıtlanmış durumda."

words, the orientalist mind and its perception of the femininity from the east are explicitly shown in this novel.

The prologue of the novel, as it can be seen from that passage, imagines the character and claims that imagination to be reality. In other words, as a person who was killed in Dersim in 1937 by the state forces, Besi is described as dangerous both with her physical appearance and her views, and this description legitimizes the massacre. That aim of the prologue makes it necessary to criticize the "wrong" approaches to the "rebellion." As a matter of fact, besides describing Besi as dangerous, without naming specific novels, Kemal Bilbaşar's novels are criticized. Due to the fact that, Besi, not as the wife of Seyit Rıza, but the wife of Alişer as Senem, is a very noble character in the novels of Bilbaşar. Although, his flaws are not directly said, it is implied signing the gendarme, described as responsible of the Dersim events, is not true. The responsibility is on internal and external enemies, who wanted to manipulate the Antakya issue. The evidence of the prologue for that is a person named İzzettin, who is introduced as an agent in the novel.[195] The writer/writers of the prologue of *Dersim 1937* is/are sure that the "rebellion" was created with the encouragement of France, and the writer adds that it is necessary to evaluate the Dersim issue in that frame. According to the prologue, the state is very aware of his internal and external enemy, and due to that, it protects the unity of the motherland. The state, according to the prologue, added that it had escaped from the Dersim issue healthy and strong like from all other previous issues.

Besides that, the text recommends a certain approach to Dersim 1937-38. According to that, it was a reclamation, public work and punishment as a counteraction. The target of these acts was to save people from the sheikhs and aghas that were exploiting the people of the region. The ignorance and backwardness are also key points of the prologue including the religious

[195]The same person is a friend of Nuri Dersimi in the Munzur Çem's novel, *Gülümse Ey Dersim* and he is definitely not an agent.

differences, which according to it, affected those "good, honest, hardworking" people. The attitude of the novel is shown, therefore, for the reader from the very beginning. The Kemalist view, the connection of the novel with the official discourse of the state on Dersim are found in the novel.[196] The text after pretending to support the Dersimis against the local leaders, contradicts itself when the explanation begins with "but": " But, certain parts of people, with an ignorance and backwardness which is formed throughout the ages, neglected improvement teams, who came after the public security team, built the roads, schools and barracks."[197]

In order to legitimize the Dersim massacre, the text chooses to split the subject. Firstly, it splits the Dersimis into local leaders and the ordinary people, and then divides the "ordinary people" into types of people that know/appreciate the improvements done in Dersim in 1937-38 and others who neglect" them. Actually, it is possible to say that the text makes the second division with no certainty. Because, it is also signed that the Dersimis, turn against the state which want to save the Dersimis from the hand of the local leaders, and thus, the Dersimis prove their ignorance by not understanding the state would civilize them, while following the local leaders would have them persecuted.

With the end of the prologue, the key words used for Dersimis, from "rebels" and "ignorance" turn into "intertwined with nature," "straightforward" and "honest." Right after such words, again the backwardness is attributed to Dersimis, and it is added that, the target of the novel is to tell the reason of the backwardness. It indicates the intent of the novel itself by counting the aims and acceptance of backwardness and ignorance as facts, showing the "legitimization of Dersim 1937-38" mission of the novel.

---

[196] Demir, Fethi. "Karşıt Tezleri Savunan Romanlar Bağlamında Dersim 1938 Olayları" in *Turkish Studies*. Volume 9/12, Fall 2014, pg. 149-160.

[197] Baykara, Barbaros. 1974. Dersim 1937. İstanbul: Akyar. pg. 6.The original text is as following: "Ancak bir kısım halk asırların oluşturduğu bir cehalet ve geri kalmışlık içinde asayiş mürfezelerinin arkasından gelen imar müfrezelerinin yaptıkları yolları açtıkları okul ve kışlaları görmezden gelmişlerdir."

Also, the prologue repeats the state discourse with a dramatic orientalist view and makes sure the readers understand the "right points" from the novel without reading it. Explaining the whole idea of fiction and reality, the novel introduces itself as a source of reality and with the dedication of the writer of the novel, combines whole texts and gives a direct message to the reader:

> "I dedicate my novel to my father, a retired finance clerk Nurettin Baykara, who contributed to my education and my growth with Turkish culture"[198]

The dedication, seems to have a massage to those people who do not "appreciate" to grow/live in Turkish culture. Seyit Rıza, his wife, Alişer, who were according to Baykara, Kurdish separatist, and the Dersim events, the bloody part of it were necessary to make "living in Turkish culture" possible. In other word, Baykara with his writer authority; aims to determine what people should appreciate and implies the superiority of Turkish culture.

In the first volume, the public house writes the prologue, but in *Tunceli 1938,* Baykara writes one with the title of 'Yazarın Önsözü' (The prologue of the writer). The first emphasis of the writer is on giving a historical background to the Dersimis to make sure the reader know that he writes writing the truth. The novel introduces Dersimis as "mountaineer/Turkish Alevis," who had known themselves as Turkish and spoken Turkish until the Yavuz Sultan Selim period. Because of the killing of Alevis by Yavuz Sultan Selim, according to Baykara, those people hated the "national unity" and began to define themselves as Alevi and became closer to the Zaza and Dümbeli sections of "Eski Part Türkleri"(Old Part Turks). After explaining the Alevi-Zaza parts of Dersimis, which happened because of the cruelty of Yavuz Sultan

---

[198] İbid, 8.The original text is as following:"Bu romanımı, okumamda ve Türk kültürü ile yetişmemede emeği bulunan babam emekli maliye memuru Nurettin Baykara'ya ithaf ediyorum."

Selim, Baykara analyses the Zaza language, and indicates that 70 percent of it is Turkish. Baykara continues finding the root of the Dersimis, and decelerates their Turkishness. According to Baykara, they were Turkish/Turkmen tribes that separated from Oğuz, Harezm, and Seljuk Turks and settled in Eastern Anatolia. Baykara, in other words, brings forward the implications of the first volume, and in addition to being the author, gives "scientific" information about then language/history of Dersimis and "proves" the Turkishness of Dersimis. It is obvious that, like the narrator of the novel, the writer himself, acts as "omniscient" narrator who is an anthropologist/linguists/historian etc.

Baykara, after completing his mission on proving the Turkishness of the Dersimis, comes to the main point-- *Dersim 1938.*[199] Baykara says that Dersimis were in a feudal life and they could not understand the good intent of the state that wanted to save them. The intervention of the state put very clearly as following: "The young Republic that wanted to establish a State-Tunceli people relationship, instead of agha-seyit and slave relationship, was deprived of the instruments and mediums for that."[200]

Baykara accepts the intervention of the state and perceives it as "good intent" of the state. Yet, the massacre, which is not possible to be covered at all, is legitimizedd with the "external enemy" pretext by Baykara. In the following line, in fact, Baykara wants Dersimis to be appreciated by the state that did *Tunceli 1938* because thanks to Dersim 1938, "Tunceli" became the most educated place in Turkey. Baykara adds that the Alevi people -thanks to Dersim 37-38- have the minimum rate of crime. The rhetoric question of Baykara, actually is

---

[199] Baykara, Barbaros.1975. *Tunceli 1938.* Ankara: Akyar.

[200] İbid, 6. The original text is as following:"Gerçekte asırların oluşturduğu feodal düzenin ilişkisi olan ağa-seyit ve kul ilişkilerinden, Devlet-Tunceli insanı ilişkileri kurmak isteyen genç Cumhuriyet bu yerde bunun vasıta ve gereçlerinden yoksundu."

significant here: "To whom do those people owe that?"[201] Baykara, does not only explain the "facts" but also wants to both impose them and to hear the appreciation of Dersimis for the massacre that "civilized" them.

Barbaros Baykara, as the author of the novels, as it is obvious, perceived the massacre as legal and fictional, and his arguments emphasize the reality of it. The two novels of Baykara, therefore, *Dersim 1937* and *Tunceli 1938,* function as perpetuity of the state discourse on Dersim.

After Baykara's two novels which aggrandize the Dersim massacre clearly, Mustafa Yeşilova, as a police commissioner, like Bilbaşar, puts himself on the side of peasants-which are "good Dersimis" who are actually Kemalist, and blames the individual failures for Dersim 1937-38 in his novel *Kopo*[202]. The novel takes the *Milliyet Roman Ödülü,* in 1978, which can be counted as a canonical award. Mina Urgan, introduces Yeşilova, as a police commissioner, who listens to Beethoven and is a "funny"/marginal person that dresses like the sheriff and whose nickname was also sheriff. [203] Yeşilova, in other world, as a "luminary" writer of the Republic, imagined a Dersim and a Dersimi figure in his progressive point of view. It is his only novel, about Dersim, in which he thought that it was necessary to legitimize the events that happened in 1937-38.

The next "Dersim novel" and the first one, which describes Dersim 1937-38 as a massacre, *Serçe*[204] was written by Ali Arslan in 1988. As a Marxist writer, Ali Arslan is introduced in the blurb as a leftist, who is persecuted by the state and who went abroad. Also, he is described with his quotation as an "old militant" who decided to express himself through writing. The

---

[201] İbid, 7. The original text is as following: "Bunu kime borçludur bu insanlar?"

[202] Yeşilova, Mustafa. 1978. *Kopo.* İstanbul: Milliyet.

[203] Urgan, Mine. 1999. *Bir Dinozor'un Gezileri.* İstanbul: YKY. Pg.141-142

[204] Arslan, Ali. 1988. *Serçe.* İstanbul: Sistem.

background of Arslan is obviously different from the previous writers in terms of the relationship with the power/state.

In addition to that, in the annotation, it is said that, Arslan objects to the ethnical discrimination which is represented in a Dersimi girl, who is exiled in 1938, while giving the atmosphere of World War II conditions. The content of the novel and the aim of it is introduced here which makes the reader expect a Marxist novel. As a matter of fact, the novel, defines Dersim 1937-38 as a massacre and the protagonist as a female character that survives from the massacre and struggles to build a life for herself.

The story of the female protagonist of the novel, Serçe, is in fact one of the stories of the "the lost girls of Dersim". The novel begins in Germany where Serçe is working and raising her children. Then the plot goes back to Serçe's childhood which actually begins with the 1938 exiles.

Serçe is given to a doctor and begins to be "educated" in that house. Yet, over the years, Serçe, changes places, marries with the burden of her past. Beside discrimination and prejudices, Serçe also struggles with the problems of her class. She migrates to Germany as a worker, and faces "real capitalism" there.

The second volume of *Serçe*[205] which was published in 2004, on the other hand, begins with Serçe's confrontation with her family in Dersim. Yet, her brother/relatives perceive her as a stranger, and Serçe who grows up as a 'Turkish' civic, person, does not settle there and comes back to Istanbul. She falls in love with the son of the doctor who adopts her first; however, Zafer, the son of doctor, upon learning that Serçe is daughter of one of the "rebels" of Dersim 38 who is still in exile in Edirne, beats Serçe and leaves her. Serçe, after that trauma, leaves

[205] Arslan, Ali. 2004. *Serçe 2*. İstanbul: Berfin.

the country and goes to Germany as a worker. During that point, the novel focus on the cruelty of the capitalist system and especially the situation of female workers in Germany.

Ali Arslan, as a "Marxist" writer, describes Dersim 1937-38 as massacre and reflects his view to the novels by focusing on the class/gender/ethnic problems of a Dersimi women.

Beginning with Ali Arslan's novel, Haydar Işık, Munzur Çem, who are known as Dersimi, and Kurdish-leftist, wrote novels on Dersim in order to tell about the massacre.[206] As a matter of fact, Işık's first novel *Dersimli Memik Ağa*[207], published in 1990 by Belge Uluslarası Yayıncılık (Belge International Publish house), which introduced itself as an "opposer to all kinds of taboos" and a believer in "freedom of thought." [208] The novel directly had the same discursive content with the writer's point of view. A Kurdish emancipation is imagined by the Kurdish movement, and Işık, as a supporter of movement, reflects that perception in his novels.[209] The second novel of Işık *Dersim Tertelesi*[210]was published in 1996 again by Belge publishing house. Işık with *Son Sığınma*[211] problematizes the situation of Dersimi "Kurdish patriots" and with *Mülteci Munzur*- the experience of an exile Dersimi after the 1937-38 massacres. Işık's last novel *Arevik*[212], on the other hand, goes back to the Armenian genocide and the Kurdish people's struggle for national emancipation, and calls Alevi/Sunni/Zaza the sub identities of Kurdishness, in order to not to confront "genocide" that Armenians experienced.

---

[206]http://www.haydar-isik.com/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=133 (connecting date: 01.04. 2015)

[207] Işık, Haydar. 1990. *Dersimli Memik Ağa*. İstanbul: Belge.

[208]http://www.belgeyayinlari.com/page.php?id=2 (connecting date: 01.04. 2015)

[209] Sait Çiya who is known his Zazaist point of view, criticize that attitude and blame Işık to have the arguments of Mustafa Yeşilova, who decelerates Dersimis as Turkish. According to Çiya, Dersim has its own identity which is Zaza not Kurdsih and also its own language which separates it from Kurds and Kurdish language. For further discussion see; Danık, Ertuğrul. "Dersim'in Siyasi Tarihi Çalışmaları ve Siyasal Görüşler." in *Kebikeç*. sayı 6, 1998. Kaya, on the other hand, in his study use ' Zaza speaking Kurds' or ' Zaza Kurds' ; Mehmet S. Kaya. 2011. *The Zaza Kurds of Turkey*. London; New York: Tauris.

[210] Işık, Haydar. 1996. *Dersim Tertelesi*. İstanbul: Belge.

[211] Işık, Haydar. 2006. *Son Sığınma*. İstanbul: Mezopotamya.

[212] Işık, Haydar. 2013. *Arevik Dersim Tertelesinde* Bir Ermeni Kızı. İstanbul: Satırarası.

Işık, as it is obvious, coherent to his Kurdish Movement background, builds his novels on the emancipation of the Kurdish nation and as a Dersimi person and gives priority to Kurdishness instead of Alevism, which is the main concern for some writers.[213]

Munzur Çem, as a Dersimi who has studies on Dersim/Alevism/Zazaki, is also known as a supporter of the Kurdish Movement.[214] The first volume of *Gülümse Ey Dersim*[215] was published in 1990, then in 1991, and the last volume was published in 1993 by Deng publishing house.

The first, in that context, can be counted as a non-canonical novel is the novel *Dersim*[216] written by Muzaffer Oruçoğlu who is known as a member of Turkish Communist Party/Marxist Leninist, in 1997 by Babek publishing house, which also published his other novels. *Dersim* like the novels of Çem and Işık, was criticized because of introducing Dersimis inaccurately.[217] While Çem and Işık are criticised because of the emphasis on Kurdishness, Oruçoğlu's novel is evaluated as a distortion in some points. The protagonist of the novel Yavan, is introduced as an anti-heroic character, and under Dersim, 1937-38 which is depicted as a "resistance," the character is also struggling for the survival. The literary details, eroticism and not romanticized protagonist, the novel differs from its contemporaries.

---

[213] For example Remzi Aydın as novelist, Sait Çiya, Seyfi Cengiz, Ebubekir Pamukçu. Remzi Aydın. 2010. Sahipsiz Çığlıklar. İstanbul: Kibele, Remzi Aydın. 2011. *Toprak Dile Geldi*. İstanbul: Kibele. These novels not directly rejectKurdish movement/Kurdishness but, focus the belief/nature of Dersim. Yet the following sources, criticize Işık, Çem, because of their involvement of Kurdish movement and each sides blame other as 'betrayer'. Sait Çiya. 1998. *Dersim Yazıları*. İstanbul: Tij. Seyfi Cengiz. 1995. *Dersim ve Dersimli*. İstanbul:Desmala Sure.

[214] As a matter of fact, the 'Alevist' fraction, has been criticizing his approach to Dersim and blames him as denying his 'Alevi identity'. For example the article published in a news portal named *Dersimnews* which blames Munzur Çem as being defending Yavuz Sultan Selim who is an Alevi murderer with the captions as following: "Munzur Çem'in Katil Yavuz Hayranlığı" (The admiration of Munzur Çem to murderer Yavuz Selim) http://dersimnews.com/manset/munzur-cemin-katil-yavuz-selim-hayranligi.html (01.04.2015)

[215] Çem, Munzur. 2013. *Gülümse Ey Dersim*. Üç cilt bir arada, İstanbul: Deng,

[216] Oruçoğlu, Muzaffer. 1997. *Dersim*. İstanbul: Babek.

[217] Oruçoğlu published an answer to those critics which were basically said that in the novel, humiliate Dersimi women and the Dersimi protagonist is depicting as weak/self-seeker etc. For the defence of the writer: http://www.muzafferorucoglu.com/articles-detail.php?lng=tr&cid=138 (Connection Date: 02.04.2015)

The ironic language and the anti-heroic protagonist of the novel make the narration almost a postmodern novel. The main character is not the ideal/honest/ patriotic type of the "thesis novels," and he has subjectivity.

Yet, besides that, the narrator's "omniscient" voice, which makes it closer to Işık and Çem's novels, can be heard in some points in the novels. That generally occurs in the novel during the conveying of the massage of the novel that actually implies the state to be responsible of the destruction of Dersim.

Beginning with 2000s, beside Işık novel's *Son Sığınma,* mentioned below, Metin Aktaş's novel *Sürgün*[218]was published in 2002 by Doz publishing house that is known with the Kurdish publications , and *Son Derviş*[219] published by Alternatif Düşünce publish house, which is criticised for not being proper to the Alevi writer.[220]

Besides Aktaş novels, Cafer Demir, as the follower of Işık and Çem wrote *Çıban*[221] in 2004 and *Sürgün*[222]in 2007, which were published by Umut Yayıncılık. Demir, beginning with *Sürgün,* under the title of "Sürgüne Dair Bir Kaç Söz" (A few words on exile) write of a memory on his exile experience. According to that, Demir was exiled in 1995 by the state to Amasya because of his political acts. Yet, Demir indicates that although he knew the language/had money, the feeling of being exiled influenced him very much, and that reminded him of the exile memories of his grandmother. Demir adds that unlike him, 38 exiles did not know the language (Turkish) and did not have money, and imagines their exile to be an influential experience which cannot be forgotten.

---

[218] Aktaş, Metin. 2002. *Sürgün*. İstanbul: Doz.

[219] Aktaş, Metin. 2009. *Son Derviş*. İstanbul: Alternatif Düşünce.

[220] One of those critics is belong to Şeyhmus Diken. Diken says that the novel is very valuable but, the selection of the publish house and putting the name of the novel as 'last Dervish' is not proper to Metin Aktaş. For the text: http://www.bianet.org/biamag/kultur/119750-saidi-kurdi-nin-romani-son-dervis (connection: 02.04.2015)

[221] Demir, Cafer. 2004. *Çıban*. İstanbul: Umut.

[222] Demir, Cafer. 2006. *Sürgün*. İstanbul: Umut.

That connection, actually implies the "unchanged" situation in terms of the political atmosphere. As a matter of fact, Demir finishes the "introduction" of the novel with his wish to have a country which does not have exile. In other words, the novel, before beginning, shows its position and criticises the present powers. As a matter of fact, he dedicates his other novel *Çıban* to his grandmother. His last novel named *Umudu ve Tutkusuyla Qopo,*[223] on the other hand, begins with an appreciation to one of the witnesses of Dersim 1938, named Seydağa Sakine, who, according to writer, contributed to the novel with her narrations.

Another novel which is introduced as a "documentary-novel" is Celal Yıldız' novel *Dersim Dile Geldi*[224]which was published in 2003 by Tij publishing house, which has been publishing books mostly about Dersim studies such as Dersim massacre or researches on Zaza language.

There are two introduction articles: one introduces the writer, and another declares the intent of the novel before the narration of the witnesses begins.

The first one consisting of the background gives information both about his personal life and his political activist past and the trigger that made him write that novel. Yıldız, as the witnesses of novel, is from Dersim and he also grows up in exile. In the text, Yıldız is introduced as a "revolutionary" person, who was a part of the "revolutionary" movement from the very beginning of his college life. As a matter of fact, when he was a teacher and a member of The Teachers Union[225] he was arrested in 1971.After the 1980 military coup of d'état, according to the text, he was forced to abandon the country and he went to Germany, again as an exile. In Germany, he worked for Amnesty International, and at the same time, according to text, he read/watched/listened about the holocaust in Germany. The text, in that context, makes a connection with the holocaust and Dersim massacre which was not accepted

---

[223] Demir, Cafer. 2005. *Umudu ve Turkusuyla Qopo*. İstanbul: Umut.
[224] Yıldız, Celal. 2003. *Dersim Dile Geldi*. İstabul: Tij
[225] Teachers Union of Turkey (Türkiye Öğretmenler Sendikası).

as a massacre and not confronted. It is obvious that the novel is implied to be a product of the necessity to face the "Dersim holocaust." [226] The text, after giving the intent of the text to the reader, emphasizes the "documentary" part of the novel by giving the research of the writer. Unlike Baykara, who gives the "newspaper" as source and Bilbaşar, the governors in Dersim during the 1937-38[227], that novel, besides the secondary sources, considers witnesses as sources of the novel.

The second article, the prologue named "Başlarken," after introducing the writer, underlines the intention of the novel: "The aim of that work is not to open the cooled wounds and whip the feelings of grudge and revenge."[228] The writers here defines his novel as a "documentary novel" and finishes the prologue with the following: "When people read this work, both the people who love Dersim and the people who are angry with Dersim, they will encounter the reality of Dersim 1938."[229]

Therefore, the novel *Dersim Dile Geldi*, with the narration of Dersimi children that experienced the 1938, declares itself as a documentary novel whose aim is to form a confrontation with the Dersim massacre. In other word, that novel identified itself both as a novel, and a document which aims to be a part of trials of a confrontation with Dersim massacre.

---

[226] Dersim 1937-38 massacre has been talking very often beginning with late 2000s. Yet, it is not accepted officially, as a massacre. Although in 2011 the prime minister said that he apologize for Dersim, that speech did not bring a real confrontation with Dersim 1937-38 in official context.

[227] Yücel, Müslüm. 2011. *Osmanlı Türk Romanında Kürt İmgesi.* İstanbul: Agora. Pg. 458

[228] Yıldız, 2003. Pg 9. The original text is as following: "Bu eserin amacı küllenmiş yaraları tekrar açıp kin ve intikam duygularını kamçılamak değildir."

[229] İbid, pg 9. The original text is as following: "Dersim'i sevenler de, Dersim'e kızanlar da bu eseri okuyunca Dersim 1938'in gerçeği ile yüz yüze geleceklerdir."

Caner Canerik's novel *Gülüzare Bitmeyen Yolculuk,*[230] published by El publishing house, also claims to be built on the narration of witnesses, who are actually the relatives of the writer himself. The novel introduces itself as being "escrowed word" of a woman who lost her father, uncles and seventeen relatives in the Dersim massacre. As a director who has already made a documentary on Dersim, precedes it with his only novel.

In that context, the novel of Sema Kaygusuz named *Yüzünde Bir Yer*[231], which was published in 2009 by Doğan publishing house, also consists the confrontation theme. Also, until this novel, the novels that depict Dersim 1937-38 as a massacre were published in the alternative publish houses, but, *Yüzünde Bir Yer*, by having been published by the main stream publishing house Doğan signified a breaking point in the approach of Dersim 1937-38. That was the sign of the changing atmosphere about the approach to Dersim 38. With the autobiographical traces, Kaygusuz's novel can be accepted as facing oneself, which is also, according to Fethi Demir, one of the first novels which has postmodernist approaches.[232]

As a matter of fact, the same year with the publication of *Yüzünde Bir Yer* in a mainstream publishing house, the Dersim issue began to be discussed in the public sphere after a speech of the prime minister of Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi Onur Öymen, (Republican Public Party). Onur Öymen, in that speech criticized the government about not having courage of fighting with terrors which succeeded in the Turkish Republic history such as in the Dersim rebellion.[233] In fact, the speech, which implied Dersim 1937-38 to be an act of "terror" and a

---

[230] Canerik, Caner. 2011. *Gülüzâre Bitmeyen Yolculuk*. İstanbul: El.

[231] Kaygusuz, Sema. 2009. *Yüzünde Bir Yer.* İstanbul: Doğan.

[232] Demir, Fethi. DEMİR, F. 2014. "Sema Kaygusuz'dan Dersim Trajedisine Dair Modern Bir Roman: Yüzünde Bir Yer" in *Journal of International Social Research*, *7*(29).

[233] The original speech of Onur Öymen is as following: "Maalesef bu ülkenin anaları çok ağladı. Tarihimiz boyunca çok şehit verdik. Çanakkale Savaşı'nda 200 bin şehidimiz vardı, hepsinin anası ağladı. Kimse çıkıp 'bu savaşı bitirelim' demedi. Kurtuluş Savaşı'nda, Şeyh Sait isyanında, Dersim isyanında, Kıbrıs'ta analar ağlamadı mı? Kimse 'analar ağlamasın, mücadeleyi durduralım' dedi mi? İlk siz diyorsunuz. Çünkü sizin terörle mücadele cesaretiniz yok." http://arsiv.taraf.com.tr/haber-yazdir-43980.html (connection date: 04.04.2015) T

rebellion, had reactions from people from Dersim. That was a breaking point of the "confrontation" to Dersim 1937-38, although it did not cause a real "settling account" because of the political atmosphere of Turkey, which did not allow for a real confrontation by protecting the ones responsible of the massacre.[234] Also, according to Bedriye Poyraz, that breaking point did not turn to an exclusive confrontation but was manipulated by the ideological sides.[235]

On the other hand, beginning with 2010, five years till 2015, there has been a boom in "Dersim novels". After the Sema Kaygusuz's novel, which was published by Doğan publishing house, Haydar Karataş's novel *Gece Kelebeği Perperik-a Soe*[236]„ was published in 2010 by İletişim publishing house, which is also one of the main stream publishing houses in Turkey. Until that time, it is possible to follow that the Dersim novels, which do not have the state ideology, were published by non-canonical publish houses; however, beginning with 2009, Dersim novels started to find a place in more popular publishing houses, which is a sign of them reaching to more reader than before.

Karataş's novels *Gece Kelebeği* and *On İki Dağın Sırrı*,[237] which were published again by İletişim in 2012, in that context, had very positive reactions from critics, and also the novels were evaluated as valuable literature works besides just as stories telling the tragedy of the Dersim. As a matter of fact, Neşe Özgen, differentiates Karataş's novels from the other novels written on Dersim because of being the voice of the subaltern, although for it to have an "original" voice for the subaltern is impossible.[238] Özgen also indicates that the Karataş's

---

[234] Bilmez, Bülent. Bilmez, Bülent. "Sözlü Tarih ve Film Belgeselciliği Aracılığıyla Bir Kıyımla Yüzleşmek ve Hesaplaşmak" in Özgür Fındık.2012. *Kara Vagon*. İstanbul: Fam. Pg.9

[235] Poyraz, Bedriye. (2013). "Cesaret et hatırla!": Dersim 1938 Tertelesi. in*Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 68(03), 063-093.

[236] Karataş, Haydar. 2010. *Gece Kelebeği Perperik-a Soe*. İstanbul: İletişim.

[237] Karataş, Haydar. 2012. *On iki Dağın Sırrı*. İstanbul: İleitşim.

[238]Özgen, Neşe. 2012. "Haydar Karataş'ın Romanlarında Dersim'in Kültürel Belleğinin

novel should be accepted as a "stand against" all nationalism and its prolongations.[239] Similarly, Fethi Demir evaluates Karataş novels as modernist-post modernist, which according to Demir make possible to go beyond the "agitative language of political novels"[240] on the contrary to the previous novels.

Another novel, which is defined by Demir as a modernist novel, is Oya Baydar's novel *O Muhteşem Hayatınız*,[241] which was published in 2012 by Can publishing house. The writers of the first novels on Dersim were not actually from Dersim such as Bilbaşar, Bayakara, Yeşilova, Arslan. Yet, beginning with Haydar Işık and Munzur Çem, the novels began to be written by writers from Dersim including Cafer Demir, Celal Yıldız, Caner Canerik, Sema Kaygusuz and Haydar Işık. On the contrary to those writers, Baydar's novel does not stand the side of one of the "victims" of the Dersim massacre, but rather stands on its guilty side, which can be counted as significant example of the Dersim novels.

In the novel, it is implied that the great quietness is not capable to be erased or left behind the greatness of the trauma of Dersim 37-38. As a matter of fact, by linking it to a famous artist and her academician daughter's story to Dersim 37-38, the novel tries to show the reader the contradiction of the "reality" and "fiction" of the characters' life/past in a fictional text. The famous diva learns that she is one of the "missing girls" of Dersim 38. The "magnificent" life of her and her daughter Arya, in other words, falls into a critical "confrontation" which shows that was not actually magnificent, but rather built upon a lie.

Yeniden Kurgusu" in *Notos Öykü*. 36.

[239] The indicated nationalism here is actually Kurdish nationalism which can be found in Haydar Işık's, Munzur Çem's, etc novels.

[240] Demir, Fethi. "Karşıt Tezleri Savunan Politik Romanlar Bağlamında Dersim 1938 Olayları." İn *Turkish Studies*Volume 9/12 Fall2014, p.149-160.

[241] Baydar, Oya.2012. *O Muhteşem Hayatınız*. İstanbul: Can.

In the end of the novel, Baydar herself, adds her story which makes her write this novel under the title of "Son Bir Not ve Teşekkür" (A last note and an appreciation). Baydar, indicates that her father was also an officer like the character 'diva' in the novel. Baydar tells her story, which she learns that her friend, the daughter of another officer, was "upskirt girl" which means "missing girl" of Dersim 38. Baydar adds that she did not understand the meaning of that until she learned what happened in Dersim and found a medal written on the "3. Ordu Manevrası Hatırası" (the memory of third army manoeuvre) that is also found by Arya in the novel. When Baydar found the medal, she did not want to believe that her father was a part of the massacre. She adds that she still does not know the truth because her parents died years before. Therefore, this novel, although a fiction, shows the main characters that learn that they are victims, while Baydar as a writer, seems to be the on the side of guilty. In that context, it is possible to note that the novel is crucial in terms of an exclusive confrontation with Dersim 1937-38. That novel with the story of the writer brings that important point into consideration. As a matter of fact Baydar quotes that:

> "This novel is not a Dersim novel. Like one of the characters of the novel, Arya, it is the novel of an overdue awareness, looking from outside and trying to understand. (...) In order to write I made use of many sources, documents, books, work of music, photographs. With my respect to all labours and hearts of them..."[242]

The passage, in fact, confronts the Dersim massacres both on a fictional level and in reality, both personally and in public. Therefore, as Baydar also noted, as an 'outsider' the understanding of Dersim, can be counted as a confrontation process. In the fruitful

[242]İbid, pg. 478. The original text is as following: "Bu roman bir Dersim romanı değildir. Roman kahramanlarından Arya gibi, geç kalmış bir farkındalığı, dışardan bakışın ve anlamaya çalışmanın romanı .(...) Yazabilmek için pek çok kaynaktan, belgeden, kitaptan, müzik yapıtından fotoğraflardan ve tanıklardan yararlandım. Hepsinin emeğine yüreğine saygıyla..."

atmosphere of 2010s Baydar's novel at least opens a door to confrontations to Dersim from different aspects.

Besides those novels, which are published in the major publishing houses and are evaluated as being more literary and less agitating, in the fruitful atmosphere of Dersim novels in 2010s, some other voices also occurred. Remzi Aydın with his "Alevist" novel, Yılmaz Akbulut and Bilal Civelek with their novels that reproduce the state discourse on Dersim, also take place in that atmosphere.

Remzi Aydın with his two novels *Sahipsiz Çığlıklar Roé Dersim*[243] that was published in 2010 and *Xârde u Korê Toprak Dile Geldi*[244]that was publishedin 2010 focus on the spiritual aspects of Dersim and its belief system under the shadow of Dersim 1937-38. The novels evaluate Alevism as a philosophy/life style or a kind of resistance to the soullessness of "modern life," which remind the first meeting of the Turkey's left with Alevism that also tried to give a form to Alevism in order to make it a part of leftist discourse.[245]

In *Sahipsiz Çığlıklar* the main character is a Dersimi who grows in exile and one day comes back to Dersim in order to make an overview on his life. So, the character both learns the details of the massacre from witnesses, and also with the spiritual atmosphere of Dersim, he makes his inner journey by finding the essence of life without the modernity that makes humans mechanic. The novel, in other words, makes a comparison with his "civic" modern life and the spiritually fulfilling life in Dersim, and stays in Dersim. In terms of themes and the focus, therefore, Aydın's novel differs from the other novels written in that period, but the with the emphasis on "exploitation" and "destruction" of Dersim and objectification of the "modernization" discourse of the state share the same themes with others. Yet, on the contrary

---

[243] Aydın, Remzi. 2010. *Sahipsiz Çığlıklar Roé Dersim.* İstanbul: Kibele.

[244] Aydın, Remzi.2011. *Xârdê u Korê Toprak Dile Geldi.* İstanbul: Kibele

[245] Küçük, Murat. "Türkiye'de Sol Düşünce ve Aleviler" *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce Cilt 8: Sol* (2007):896-935. Pg. 904.

to Işık, Çem or Demir, who recommend an alternative modernization under Kurdishness, Aydın, recommends Alevi rituals and spiritual life in Dersim as a "philosophy of life." As a matter of fact, his novel *Xârde u Korê*, Aydın introduces it as following:

> "There was ancient doctrines here centuries ago. This philosophy was so deep and meaningful that the system was afraid, bigoted, and reactionary structures were afraid. That magnificent doctrine/philosophy escaped far away, now we are trying to learn pieces of that philosophy again and with admiration from the Far East, India, Middle East, and Africa."[246]

Aydın, in that passage, attributes a philosophical essence to Dersim's spiritual life. Aggrandizing the old/ancient Dersim and its spiritual atmosphere focuses on a different aspect of Dersim and imagines a certain kind of spiritualism for Dersim. As a matter of fact in the novel *Xârde u Korê* there is a grandmother who is the wise person of the society and her granddaughter who will take her place after her death. The society, as that the novel imagines, is free from gender, property relations and its members are very loyal/respectful to each other. As a matter of fact, in the novel the spiritual reason of Dersim 1937-38 for the betrayal of Armenia is shown. The betrayal brings an end to the society.

Besides, Aydın's novel with his themes/focus differ from the dominant trend of 2010, Bilal Civelek's and Yılmaz Akbulut's novels also remain "contrarian" by producing the official discourse on Dersim.

Civelek's novel *Mustafa Kemal'in Kuşları Dersim Yanıyor* is published 2012 by Yediveren publishing house.[247] In the prologue of the novel, Civelek indicates that he made research in the region for a while and defines the Dersim 1937-38 as "rebellion." Also, he adds that in

---

[246]İbid, pg 10. The original text is as following: "Bu topraklarda kadim öğretiler vardı yüzyıllar önce. Bu felsefe öylesine derin ve anlamlıydı ki sistem korktu, bağnaz ve gerici yapılar korktu. O muhteşem öğreti/felsefe çok uzaklara kaçtı, şimdi onun kırıntıların Uzak Doğu, Hindistan, Ortadoğu, Afrika felsefesi olarak yeniden ve hayranlık duyarak öğrenmeye çalışıyoruz."

[247] Civelek, Bilal. 2012. *Mustafa Kemal'in Kuşları Dersim Yanıyor*. İstanbul: Yediveren

writing that he did not use documents but he used the narrations of the people and wanted to present them to public. Like Barbaros Baykara, the writer claims that, he looked objectively as much as possible and according to him, it is everyone's duty to tell this knowledge to next generations. Also, he recommends the readers to read the novel without the "ideological glasses." The writer, in other words, from the beginning, by defining Dersim 1937-38, shows his side and invites the reader to his side, which according to him is the "right" view. As a matter of fact, Nuri Dersimi is depicted as an "agent," the Dersimis are as ones "deceived" by the "exteriors" and Sunnism and Turkishness are described as the right religion and ethnicity in the novel. After a big number of novels that try to tell the Dersim massacre, Civelek's approach seems to be an answer to the debates on confrontation with the Dersim massacre. On the other hand, Yılmaz Akbulut's novel *Dersim'in Dikeni,*[248]which was published in 2011, repeats the state discourse which blames the social structure of Dersim as guilty of Dersim massacre. Therefore, *Mustafa Kemal'in Kuşları Dersim Yanıyor* and *Dersim'in Dikeni* are the latest examples of the novels that reproduce the official discourse on Dersim in fictional area.

Those novels, therefore, from 1960 to 2015, consist almost an exclusive list of Dersim novels that mainly focus on Dersim 1937-38.[249]

The "triangle" circle: the focus novels

With an overview to the Dersim novels as much as it is possible, it is obvious that there are over thirty novels, and a boom of the Dersim novels occurred in 2010s.

In 1960s-70s, the Dersim novels repeat the state discourse of cruelty of the local powers, heroic position of the Republic who saves people. From the 80s and 90s the leftist writers, especially Kurdish leftists, who have Dersim origins, began to write in order to refute the thesis of the state discourse that had formed the novels on Dersim. In other words, with the

[248] Akbulut, Yılmaz. 2011. *Dersim'in Dikeni.* İstanbul: Cumartezleri.
[249] Appendix 1

raise of the Kurdish movement in the 1990s, the Dersimi, writers who also support the Kurdish movement, began to "rewrite" both the official history that was given by the state and the novels written in that path.

That was, in fact, a reproduction of the argument of those novels with the "counter thesis." As a matter of fact, the novels written by Kurdish leftist had also imagined a certain Dersimi type by complaining about the "ignorance" of Dersimis and desiring a modern society based on the Kurdishness.

Kemal Bilbaşar's novels *Cemo*, *Memo1,Memo 2*, in that context, focus on the "dramatic" situation of the Dersimi peasants, who according to Bilbaşar, have been persecuted by the local powers. The focus of his novels, therefore is a necessity for the "intervention" of the state because of the cruel, feudal leaders. Baykara's novels *Dersim 37* and *Tunceli 38*, on the other hand, directly aim to legitimize the massacre. Yeşilova, with writing the story of the Qopo Hüseyin in *Kopo*, draws a Kemalist Dersimi portrait. Those writers and their mentioned novels are first examples of the Dersim 1937-38 novels with their discursive structure selected for this study.

Besides those novels written in-between late 1960s and late 1970s, Bilal Civelek, after a long period, in 2010s repeats Bilbaşar and Baykara's arguments such as the involvement of "exterior powers" and the liquidation of feudal leaders or Turkishness of Dersimis with his novel *Mustafa Kemal'in Kuşları Dersim Yanıyor*. Besides Baykara, Bilbaşar and Yeşilova, Civelek's novel, because their significant position, which is not fixed to the period trend with Dersim novels in 2010s, are included in the study.[250]

[250]That time period, as it is mentioned below, the 'confrontation' is an important theme, and the Dersim 1937-38, generally is described as massacre. On the other hand, Yılmaz Akbulut's novel could also be taken to that part, but, Akbulut's novel repeats the cruelty of aghas, begs, on the other hand, Civelek, with a declaration of

On the other hand, beginning with Haydar Işık's novel *Dersimli Memik Ağa*, the arguments of the previous novels are reproduced/rewritten from the point of view of the Kurdishness. Işık's second novel *Arevik* strengthens the arguments of those novels that sign the state as the source of the 'evil' and Dersimis as the victim. Munzur Çem's novel, Gülümse Ey Dersim's three volumes, on the other hand, give an "alternative" history of a young republic, and depicts events before and after Dersim 37-38 by counting Dersim as part of Kurdistan and an imagination of modernization again based on the Kurdishness. Çem's novel, because of that, becomes a coherent with Işık's novels. Cafer Demir novel *Umudu ve Tutkusuyla Qopo* is a direct example of the argumentative derivation which those novels that followed. *Kopo* of Yeşilova is, in fact, rewritten by Demir, by reproducing the "target" source's argument.

Therefore, the first and the second group of novels form a table which creates a discursive triangle between the Dersim 1937-38 history/historiography, the "statist novels," which aim to legitimize the massacre, and the opposed novels, which derivate the discourse of the state novels. This significant situation determined which novels would be the focus of that study. Besides the conceptual framework that is drawn with this dynamic of the relationship, the number novel forced to select a few of them due to limitation of that study. Although, almost an exclusive list of Dersim novel is put here, due to the conceptual frame and limitation of the study, the rest of list can only introduced very shortly here as a part of discussion on Dersim 1937-38.

CHAPTER IV:

The Dersim 1937-38 Novels: The Orientalist and the "Derivative" Discourses

---

truthfulness, brings some new 'argument' such as signing Nuri Dersimi as an agent and Seyit Rıza a 'deceived' character. On the contrary to the whole other novels of that group, Civelek, defends 'feudal' leader, Seyit Rıza.

Derrida's famous quote says, "There is no outside of the text"[251] is very expletive in the analysis of Dersim 37-38 oriented novels. In the different time periods, coming from different authorial backgrounds, the approaches of the novel/the text show a certain aim of the text. All these novels have their own intent which is tied to the 37-38 massacres. The text itself at every turn reproduces the Dersim 37-38 massacres in different ways based on ideology such as official history or eye witness accounts. Especially the early example of these novels actually can be defined as a 'thesis novel' which can be defined as novels with a special purpose/ideology for the reader and a didactic/intrusive narration style to convince/educate the reader. The text of the novel becomes a construction area of different approaches/ideologies. Although the aim of this chapter is not to make a linguistic deconstruction of the main sources, it takes the novels as independent texts excluding their writing date/authorial background. With the focus on the Dersim 1937-1938, in this study the novels will be analysed in their universe where they are linkedto one another in the textual area.

4.1 The Orientalist Discourse and the Legitimization of the Massacre

In Turkish Republican Literature, the first novels about the Dersim massacre are Kemal Bilbaşar's novels *Cemo* published in 1966, and *Memo1,Memo 2*published in 1969-1970. Following him, in 1974 Barbaros Baykara's novel titled*Dersim 1937,*which directly referenced the massacre, and the second volume *Tunceli 1938* were published in 1975. Following Baykara, Mustafa Yeşilova's novel *Kopo* was published in the 1978. The last book which has similar traces was published in 2012;Bilal Civelek's novel *Mustafa Kemal'in Kuşları Dersim Yanıyor* after a longpauseagain reproduced a similar discourse about Dersim 1937-1938 andis simultaneously coherent to the official discourse.

[251]Derrida, Jacques. 1998. *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, Pg 158.

Cemo

Cemo[252] is the first novel focused on the process of the Dersim massacres. The novel has two different narrators: Cano and Memo. In the first part, Cano explains his past and the birth of his daughter under the shadow of the significant events such as the promulgation of the Republic and the Sheik Said rebellion. The narration of Memo includes the process of the Dersim massacre and the 'fight' of Memo against the social structure of Dersim as a hero who is a peacefulbard and 'more civilized' than the Dersimis.

Cano, as the first narrator, gives a frame about the social structure of Dersim which is actually described as an exploitation of local powers:

> "Some of us were grappled with the mire of the paddy, some of us with the wolf of the snow clad, some of us with the gendarme of the Ottomans. Some of us were the shepherd, farmer, some of us were the smuggler, gunmen and some of us were brigand of beg." [253]

By describing the slavery condition of the peasant and showing the persecution of the local power, the image of the Republic, the state and its founder Mustafa Kemal Atatürk reach the 'rescuer' position in the text.[254]Therefore, it is not surprising that, when Cano learns that there is a pasha who changed the system of Dersim he immediately takes the pasha's side. As the

---

[252] Bilbaşar, Kemal. 1966. *Cemo.* İstanbul: Evren. The following print is used in the study: Kemal Bilbaşar. 1971. *Cemo.* İstanbul: Tekin.

[253] İbid, pg. 16 "kimimiz çeltik tarlasının batağıynan, kimimiz karlı dağın kurduynan, kimimiz Osmanlı'nın zaptiyesiynen boğuşurduk. Kimimiz çoban çifçi, kimimiz,çobanı çiftçisi, kimimiz ayıngacısı, tüfekçisi eşkıyasıydık begin"

[254]Also in those following articles which were mostly published in *Demokrat İzmir* newspaper, Show his admiration to Atatürk both politiacally and personly which also construct the ideological base of his three novels analyzed in this study: "İki Hatıra", *Fikirler,* nr. 194, 15 Kasım 1939, pg.14-15; "Atatürkçülük", *Kök,* nr. 1, Mayıs 1955, pg. 5-6; "Ölümünün 22. Yıldönümünde: Bir Kere Daha Vatanı Kurtaran Atatürk", *Demokrat İzmir,* nr. 4859, 10 Kasım 1960; "Atatürk'ten Anılar" (Memduh Bilge'den naklen), *Demokrat İzmir,* nr. 4866, 17 Kasım 1960; "İlk Yaşını Doldururken Evrimin Nedenleri Üzerinde Bir İnceleme 3: Atatürkçülüğün Şahlanması", *Demokrat İzmir,* nr. 5032, 29 Nisan 1961; "Ölümsüz Atatürk'ün Güneş Gibi Doğduğu Gün: 19 Mayıs 1919", *Demokrat İzmir,*nr. 5051, 19 Mayıs 1961; "Atatürk'e Ait Bir Hatıra: Devrimciliği her zaman uyanıktı.", Demokrat İzmir, nr. 5221, 10 Kasım 1961. (Müberra Bağcı. 2002. "Kemal Bilbaşar'in Hayati Ve Eserleri Üzerinde Bir İnceleme". Unpublished Master's Thesis. İzmir: Ege University,)

result it is indicated here that without the state, Dersim is obliged to slavery, and because of that fact, taking the side of the state is the right thing to do for Dersimis. That in fact contributes the legitimization of Dersim 1937-1938 as a modernization movement.

As a matter of fact, when Cano hears about Mustafa Kemal and the new regime, he says that he is 'the slave' of this new pasha and will fight the people who revolt against him. This sudden commitment in one hand shows the 'intelligence' of the Dersimis who are wise enough to understand the 'superiority' of the Republic and the cruelty of the local system. On the other hand, the ignorance of the Dersimis in not understanding that 'slavery' does not exist in the *Cumhuriyet* regime implies the need of Dersimis to be educated by the state. In other words, in the text, Cano is depicted as a potential, loyal Republic citizen who needs the 'education' of the state.[255]

In addition to Dersimis being depicted aspotential citizens, Mustafa Kemal with his 'glamorous blond hair and unbelievable blue eyes' is depicted as the rescuer of them.Erik JanZürcher, points that the images of Atatürk have a certain official meaning which tacitly represents power and consolidates the strength of the 'unity and solidarity' discourse.[256] Therefore, the emphasis of the 'glamorous blond hair and unbelievable blue eyes' of Mustafa Kemal in the novel reproduces the cult of Atatürk.[257] In other words, the aim is to depict Atatürk as a symbol who is the liberator of the country and with that affirm the Kemalist ideology in the text.

---

[255] Kemal Bilbaşar as a graduate of teacher school, represents the new 'luminary' type of Republic that has the mission of enlightening the public, considering the Anatolia people in the frame of the Kemalist ideology. As a Kemalist luminary, Bilbaşar tells his memories with Mustafa Kemal Atatürk when he was a student in Gazi Orta Muallim Mektebi ve Terbiye Enstitüsü, he says that Atatürk 'enlightened' them about Turkish history and Literature. Bilbaşar proceeds that 'enlightining' mission in the novel. Therefore, with the leadership of Atatürk, Bilbaşar perceive himself as a 'teacher' of people who aims to teach the truths to the ignorance Dersimis. (Kemal Bilbaşar, "Atatürkçülük", Demokrat İzmir, nr. 3767, 10 Kasım 1954)

[256] Zürcher, Eric Jan. 2005. *Savaş, Devrim ve Ulusallaşma*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi yayınları,

[257] Zürcher, "Kemalist Düşüncenin Osmanlı Kaynakları". *Modern TÜrkiyede Siyasi Düşünceler*, Ed. Ahmet İnsel. İstanbul: İletişim pg 44-56. Pg.51

Besides that, according to the novel[258], the meaning of the 'new state' and Mustafa Kemal, in terms of Dersimis, is the eradication of the local powers that put the Dersimis in that problematic position:

> "He said, 'Kayı people! You will not make tobacco smuggling and robbery. You will not torture the poor people; you will consider the poor and rich equal,' he commanded. 'If you don'tdo what I say, you think about the rest,' he said. 'I can come with my army and like what I did to the sultan, destroy the whole of your power,' he said. Some of agha and sheik sent him gifts and asked for mercy. Some of them revolted."[259]

The 'new pasha' and his state promise eradication of the spiritual and local leaders who forced Dersimis to be being robbers, brigand or smugglers. Also, by the 'equality' discourse the text promises 'classless', 'equal, 'civilized' life for Dersim with the new state. The Turkish Republic, in other words, according to that passage, is close to socialist discourse than to a liberal Republic which can be pointed as the 'trace' of the author.[260] That equality discourse depicted here is imagined in the frame of 'Anatolian villages/peasants.' It is actually

---

[258]The graduation thesis of Bilbaşar gives a clue about the discourse as following: "So, we will look for the place where the civilization was born and the people who created this civilization and who brought it to other places on their shoulders. We will try to analyse the evolvement of the civilization continually since it was born and, we will try to analyse and make the role of the Central Asian Turks in that evolvement clear."

Bilbaşar, Kemal. 1935. *Medeniyetin Doğuş ve Yayılışında Türklerin Rolleri*, , İstanbul: Burhaneddin Matbaası, pg 56. The Original text is as following: "İşte bu denemede medeniyet güneşinin doğduğu yeri ve bu medeniyeti yaratanları, onu omuzlarında başka diyarlara götürenleri arayacağız. Medeniyetin doğduğu günden beri hiç durmadan tekâmül ettiğini, bu tekâmülde Orta Asyalı Türk soylarının rollerini tetkik ve tebarüz ettirmeye çalışacağız"

[259] Bilbaşar, *Cemo*, pg. 23. The original text is as following: "-Ey Kayılar! demiş. Bundan böyle uğrılık ayıngacılık yapmayacaksınız, demiş, fakire zulmetmeyeceksiniz, zengini, fakiri bir tutacaksınız, buyurmuş. Dediklerimi yapmazsanız gerisini siz düşünün gayrı demiş. Ordumla üzerinize varır, padişah gibi sizin de hanumanızı söndürürüm demiş. Şıhların ağaların bir bölüğü, armanğanlar yollamış aman dilemiş. Bir bölüğü de baş kaldırmış."

[260] Kemal Bilbaşar was a member of Türkiye İşçi Partisi which was the first socialist party which could have prime minister in parliament. (Bağcı, 2002). The Kemalist view, was also has an influence on that time period's leftist. As a matter of fact, Murat Belge, including emphasising the Kemalist influence on the Turkish leftist, he the quotes that: "Bu the socialism which find aroused because of some conditions of conjuncture in 60s, did not do that, it was applauded the power which was transgressed the democratic principles." Murat Belge, "Türkiye'de Sosyalizm Tarihinin Ana Çizgileri" *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce Cilt 8: Sol* (2007): 19-49. The original text is as following: "Oysa 60'larda konjonktürün bazı özellikleri nedeniyle hayat bulan sosyalizm bunu yapmıyor, demokratik ilkeleri çineyen güce alkış tutuyordu."

about liquidation of 'feudal leaders' and placing the republic rules instead. Therefore, the equality discourse does not involve as an ethnical/religious equality, which shows itself immediately by imagining Dersim as entity and supposing them to be Turkish. Addressing Dersimis as "Kayılar" also has an underlying notion which determines the borders of the equality discourse. 'Kayı' is supposed to be the Turkish ancestors of the Ottoman dynasty. Therefore, it is possible to point that the choice of words is not a coincidence, and the text indicates these Dersimis as Kayı, and 'naturally' Turkish.

Besides that, although it is claimed that the Kemal Pasha is against the sheikhs or aghas, Sheikh Mahmut is drawn as a positive character and called the 'Pasha's man'.[261] The pasha who is depicted as the enemy of the 'feudal' lords, in other words, proceeds the relationships with them.

As a matter of fact, Sheikh Mahmut as a supporter of the state, asks Cano to fight for the sake of the Pasha against the Sheikh Said rebellion. The rebellion is described as a persecution:

> "In the meantime, we learned that Elaziz was conquered by *Şıh Saidliler.*[262] The Zaza people plundered the Ottomans' homes, they slaughtered the innocent women and children of Ottomans." [263]

The protagonist Cano describes Sheikh Said and his supporter as tyrants. At the same time, Cano for the first time sees the "Ebabil Kuşları"[264] (swifts) of Gazi Pasha which actually

---

[261] Bilbaşar, Cemo. Page 23. This cooperation which the wirtier neglects, according to Burinessen, proceeds even after Sheikh Said rebellion 1925. Martin Van Bruinessen. 2003. *Ağa Şeyh ve Devlet.* Çev. Banu Kalkan. İstanbul: İletişim. pg . 295-296.

[262] In the novel, the people who joined the rebellion of Şeyh Sait and after the rebellion who supported Şeyh Said are called as 'Şıh Saidliler' in the novel.

[263] İbid, pg. 26. The original text is as following: "Derken, Şıh Saidlilerin Elaziz'i düşürdükleri haberi geldi. Zaza'lar Osmanlı'nın evlerini dükkânlarını yağmalamışlar, günahsız kadınları çocukları kılıçtan geçirmişlerdi."

[264] The legendary birds that attacked the governor of Yemen Ebrehe in 570-571 in Mecca. That metephore was used by the Cumhuriyet newspaper for Turkish Air Force.

represents the Turkish Air Force.[265] In other words, the air forces are introduced as a liberator that will help to rescue the people from the local powers, who are 'tyrants'. Therefore, depicting a clear binary opposition by putting the state on the 'good side' and the local powers and the rebels in the 'bad side' makes the intent of the text more obvious.[266]

As a matter of fact, by fighting against Sheikh Said and not being on the side of the aghas/begsCano becomes a symbol of the 'civilized savage'. In other words, the 'savage' Cano, who was a robber, brigand, abductor and a man eating heads of sheep in a very primitive way[267], by choosing the side of Mustafa Kemal and his government, transforms into a 'noble savage' in the text.[268] In the beginning of the text, by giving very detailed description of the wildness and savageness of Cano it is indicated that these people need to be civilize by the state. The volunteer of civilization movements of the state, therefore, cannot be called simply a 'savage' anymore, but he is called a 'noble savage," which also proves the power of the state.[269]

In that context Cano, Cemo and Memo the protagonists of the novels climb from being 'savages' to being the 'noble savages'. Not being a part of rebellions and being loyal to the

---

[265]Robert Olson, indicates that, in foundation of the repuplic ideology, the Turksih Air Force had inmportant role, especially by repressing uprises such as Dersim 37-38. As it is obvious in the passage, Bilbaşar, mentions Turkish Air Force with proud. Olson, Robert, "The Kurdish Rebellions of Sheikh Said (1925), Mt. Ararat (1930), and Dersim (1937-38): Their Impact on the Development of theTurkish Air Force", *Welt Das Islams*, Vol. 40, Number 1, March 200, pg. 67-94.

[266] The phrase 'intent of text' is used as the total goal/massage of the text which is supposed to reach to the readers/ addressee.

[267] Bilbaşar, Cemo, pg.18. The original text is as following: "ya bismillah deyip kelleyi kaptım, burnundan başlayarak katur kutur, kemiği ile tüm yedim bitirdim. Ben kurt köpeği kimi kafamı sağa sola sallayıp kemikleri katırdattıkça, millet kırılırdı gülmekten" pg 19"Kıllı kulağını dişlerimle kaptım, bağırta bağırta koparttım kulağının üst yanını"

[268] Moran, 2009. Pg 22-23.

[269] With the civilization mission the state both created the opportunity to show its power by 'disciplining' its orient and also foung the legitimization of massacres in Dersim which is introduced as a salvation. The wirter here, contrubites both aims of the state. Tanıl Bora, "1930'lardan 1950'lere Resmi Milliyetçiliğin Dersim' Bakışı: Asimilasyonizmin Kırılganlığı" in Zeliha Hepkon, Songül Aydın and Şükrü Aslan. 2013. *Dersim'i Parantezden Çıkarmak*. İstanbul: İletişim.

state are the certain requirement of the nobility that the author ascribes to them. On the other hand, the local leaders are drawn as cruel revolts, brigand and robbers.[270] Therefore, the narration of Cano introduces the 'primitive' life conditions of Dersim, the cruelty of the aghas and sheikhs, and the 'need' for a new regime which was already founded by Mustafa Kemal.

Cano, who suffers from Sarikoğlu, a very cruel agha who desires to marry his daughter, wants to find a good husband for his daughter in order to not give her to the agha. He arranges a play fight and decides to give her daughter to the winner of the fight. Memo, who is the other narrator of the novel, wins the fight and gets married to Cemo. The narration of Memo on the other hand represent a noble, wise and powerful poet who resists the aghas and begs.[271] Memo, introduce himself as an orphan[272] whose father was killed by Sheikh Said's men and describes that scene: "In the moonlight, they slaughtered the men, women, girls, and boys like slaughtering sheep."[273] Memo's father and mother are also presented as victims of the Sheikh Said's 'savage' rebellion. Memo's uncle, after the death of his family raises him as awise bard

---

[270] In the novels these words "Eşkıya, uğırlıkçı, zalim" are used for Şeyh Sait and his supperters and also generally for the other aghas, sheiks beg who are not loyal to state. For example Şıh Mahmut is also a sheikh but he is not one of those 'eşkıya'.

[271] Here, the role of Memo can be thought as the mission of Bilbaşar as a novelist. Bilbaşar, by eliminating his voice by speaking from mouth of a 'local' person, it is possible to say, aims to create a more 'objective' position that can make his aproach more intimate. That is percieved in that way to some extend, thus, Ömer Türkeş points that it is not fair to doubt about Bilbaşar's good intention .(http://www.radikal.com.tr/ek_haber.php?ek=ktp&haberno=1970, connection date: 02.02.2015) On the other hand, the description of Jale Parla about Tanzimat novel and its funciton,as following, seems to be valid in Bilbaşar's novel : The Turkish novel was born as a product of communitarian culture and epistemology. Like the other institutions which was adopted, the novel also written according to western models with a prudent imitation. The novel writer attiuded like as a renewer and reformer, but the guardianshipism of theem always went beyond the renewism. Because according to novel writer, there was an urgent need for a custodian for a people who needs to be educated and a culture who lost its political custodian."
Although Jale Parla points that analyze in the frame of Tanzimat novels, in terms of 'educating' role and being the under of the custody, Bilbaşar novels fit that frame. Parla, Jale. 2008. *Babalar ve Oğullar*. İstanbul: İletişim, pg. 13-14. The original text is as following: "Türk romanı camiacı bir kültür içinde beslenen idealist bir dünya görüşünün ve bilgi kuramının ürünü olarak doğdu. Batılılaşma süreci içinde benimsenen diğer kurumlar gibi, roman da tedbirli bir öykünmeyle batı modellerine göre yazıldı. Roman yazarı bir yenilikçi ve reformcu gibi tavır aldı, ama vesayetçiliği her zaman yenilikçiliğinin önüne geçti. Çünkü roman yazarına göre ortada eğitilecek bir halk ile siyasi vasisini kaybetmiş bir kültürün acil bir vasi gereksinimi vardır"

[272] The fatherlessness/orphanism is also evaluated as a charactirsitic of Tanzimat novels' protoganists who are seeking for an authority. (Parla, *Babalar ve Oğullar,* pg.29) Memo, in that context also gets close to the same aproach which actually finds its 'father' figure who is obviously Mustafa Kemal Atatürk.

[273] Bilbaşar, *Cemo*, pg.58.The original text is as following: " Ay ışığında koyun boğazlar gibi boğazladılar, eri avradı kızı oğlanı"

and brave man who is very peaceful but also is a good fighter. The uncle's function, in that context, is being the mentor of Memo. The qualities that make Memo a heroic character, the notion behind him is introduced by the advice of his uncle.

As a matter of fact, when Memo decided to leave home and go to the Dersim region to sell his bells, his uncle invokes Memo about Dersimis who are against the Ottomans.[274] He recommends him not to regard the Ottomans as an enemy because 'Kayılar' (*Kayı* people) and the Ottomans are children of the same mother.[275] The uncle of Memo, after emphasizing the 'common' roots of the Dersimis and other people adds that what Gazi Pasha wants is the desire of God which is supposed to create an equality between aghas and the servants. Sheikh Said and his supporter, according to Memo's uncle, did not want equality brought by the new state law, and they revolted against the state.[276] Finally, the uncle warns Memo to be careful about the Dersim aghas who have the same potential of instigation/rebellion. After his uncle's admonitions, Memo begins travelling from village to village in order to sell his bells. In the meantime, he falls in love with *Şıh Kızı* Senem (Senem, the daughter of the Sheikh). However, her father does not allows Senem to marry*Çancı* Memo (bell seller Memo) because he is not a sheikh/agha.

Without solving this love issue, one day the gendarme makes a sudden attack to his home. Memo, like other people of the region, does not have an identity card or a register. One of the gendarmes' comments, shows the view of the state about Dersimis: "He is just like others, he is both not registered and a deserter."[277] This quotation shows the exterior intervention of the state towards the region. Until that time, they did not need a registration. Yet, by the intimate

---

[274] The word 'Ottomans' both represents the Ottoman State and teh Turkish Republic in the novel.

[275] Ibid, pg. 63.The original text is as following: "Onların sözlerine kanıp Osmanlı'yı düşman belleme! Kayılarla Osmanlılar bir ananın yavrularıdır."

[276] Bilbaşar, here, depicts a 'Socialist' Kemalism which according to him, he fought with Sheikh Said in order to provide equality in society. In that context, Bilbaşar, depicts Sheikh Said as an agha who rebelled in order to proceeds his cruelty over people and Atatürk by oppresing him aimed to 'save' innocent poor people.

[277] Ibid, pg. 69. The original text is as following: " Bu da ötekiler gibi, hem nuhus hem asker kaçağı"

relationship established between Candarma Ali and Memo, the secret behind this arrest is revealed. Senem's father can be responsible for that. By that way, Memo as the narrator indicates the sheikhs and aghas to be guilty but ignores the role of the state on that events. Also, the 'uncanny' relationship of the state and the people is shown by the following quotation:

> "Your situation is hard, said Candarma Ali. You will be punished because of not being registered. Because of being a deserter, you will be kept in the military for a very long time. If a protector is not found for you, you will stay in military exactly two, three years. Don't you have any body to protect you?"[278]

The state, according to this quotation, has been registering the people in this region and the people who were not registered before are being punished. The contradiction here, is obvious: until that age Memo did not need a registration and was not registered by the state or any other power. Yet, now, he is punished by the state because for not being registered. Although the text implies the state to be a fair and equitable power, it is not able to hide the problematic structure of the state.According to Memo that happened because of the 'factious' sheikh, Senem's father; however,it is self-explanatory that the aim of the text is to whitewash the approach of the state.

With the help of Candarma Ali Memo takes an identity and with that identity goes to the induction center. Although Memo and his uncle decide to pay for military service and make shorter the service period, the director in the center tells the importance of military service:

> The person against Memo is the sheikh of the fifteen villages. It is difficult to cope with such men as a naive young men. Even our republic government overpowered them. The best thing to do is to deliver Memo. He would be both paid the national service and escape from that trouble. (...) As long as he stays in the military service, it

[278] İbid, pg. 70. The original text is as following: " Vay kurban, dedi candarma Ali, senin halin zordur. Nuhusa kaydını geçmedin diye ceza yiyeceksin. Kaçakçılık yüzünden de uzun süre askerde tutacaklar seni. Bir arkalayanın bulunmazsa, iki üç yıl asker ocağında kalırsın sağlam. Kimin kimsen yok mu sana sahip çıkacak?"

> will be beneficialfor him. The barrack is a school, the barrack is a place of civilization. If he opens his eyes, in one and a half year, he will grow up and becomes a man. He will learns to read and to write, learn the rights that the republic gives to its people, learns the ways. Shortly, he will become a man who can distinguish the good from the bad.[279]

As a tool of modern society military service is described as an education place for the 'ignorant' and 'uncivilized' local people of region. As a 'noble savage' Memo voluntarily goes to military service. According to the director, he will become a 'real man', after civilization which he will have during military service. The director reminds him that the first requirement of the military is to obey and praises him to be observant.[280]

However, what Memo learns beside literacy during the military service is discrimination. One of the lieutenants, who hates Zazas, behaves very rough against the Zaza soldiers and beats them, including Memo. After a while, Memo learns that lieutenant has a reason for that. During the Sheikh Said rebellion, his wife is killed by the rebels. When officer tells his story about why he hates Zazas, he adds that they killed his wife and they are dangerous for the country as well:

> "The government changed its approach. It behaves in a friendly manner to Zazas. This is a very wrong way. There is no point of removing pressure over

[279] İbid, pg. 77. The original text is as following: "Memo'nun karşısındaki on beş köyün şıhı imiş. Böyle bir adamla toy delikanlının başa çıkması zor. Cumhuriyet hükümetimiz bile daha onların hakkından gelemedi. Iyisi mi memoyu sevkiyat edelim Hem vatani borcunu bir ayak evvel bitirsin hem de basşı. dertten beladan kurtulsun"..asker ocağında ne kadar uzun kalsa okadar hayrına olur memonun. Kışla bir mektep, kışla bir medeniyet yeri. Gözünü açarsa bir buçuk yıl içerisinde yetişir, adam olur. Okuma yazma öğrenir, cumhuriyetin vatandaşa tanıdığı haklası öğrenir, zagonları öğrenir. Sözün kısası iyiy kötüden ayıracak bir adam olur."

[280] The attitutude of the wirter, which is revealing with the 'narrator characters', the writer, Bilbaşar, confirms that point of view.

> them. They will understand that sooner or later. We will have trouble, you will see. I do not doubt that, this trouble will come from the Zazas."[281]

After the lieutenant finishes his story, Memo immediately forgives him for his behavior and agrees with his hatred because the same people, the rebels of Sheikh Said, killed his parents before. The dangerousness of the Zazas, in this way, proved withMemo, 'local /Zaza person,' --which is also a legitimization of the suppression over the region. Therefore, obviously, the discourse that the Dersim issue stems from the local powers, sheikhs, aghas, is repeated here.

In the novel, on the other hand, besides sheikhs and aghas, the gendarme is also blamed. When Memo learns his uncle's death, he goes to gendarme and says that he is suspicious about the sheikh. But, the gendarme does not pay attention to his complaints and sends him away. Memo's reflection to this event, show the authorial approach towards the state and the local powers:

> "We complained about the agha, the gendarme would almost beat us and put us into jail. Again we were blamed. Whose government is this? This government, does it belong to Kemal Pasha or the agha?"[282]

The question of Memo, has its answer in the novel. The government belongs to Kemal Pasha, and sooner or later, even at high costs, it will be taken from the hands of the local powers. The problems of the region, in other words, will be completely solved after a powerful governance

---

[281] İbid, pg. 86. The original text is as following: "Hükümetin tutumu değişmiştir. Zazalara güler yüz gösterir. Çok yanlışdır bir yoldur. Üzerilerinden baskıyı kaldırmaya gelmez. Bunu ergeç anlayacaklardır. Başımıza yeni bir bela açılacak, göreceksiniz. Hiç şüphe yok Zazalardan gelecek bu bela"

[282] İbid, pg. 101. The original text is as following: "Biz ağadan şikâyetçi olduk, candarma az kalsın bizi döğüp deliğe tıkacaktı. Gene biz suçlandık. Ule bu hukumat kimin hukumatı? Kemal Paşa'nın mı yoksa ağanın hukumatı mı?"

provided in the region. Therefore, according to novel the republic and Mustafa Kemal, will be the rescuers of the people, peace-maker of the region.[283]

The ignorance of the local powers is also a vital emphasis in the novel.[284] The commander, who is very supportive during Memo's military service and continuously helpful to him after his discharge, is represented as a Republican enlightened person. According to the commander, the degenerate relationship between local powers and the local governorsstems from the weakness of the local governors. Although, according to the 'luminary' commander, these aghas, begs and sheikhs are extremely ignorant and even cannot speak properly,they know everything that happened, and it looks like even created a network in the villages and towns.[285] The confusion of the commander about the 'knowledge' of the member of the local system of Dersim matched the orientalist view of the authorial eye.[286] The authentic knowledge and life of the local people are perceived as an unbelievable phenomenon.

---

[283] Begining with the Tanzimat, the 'survival of the state' was the main concern of the luminaries. That tradition, it is possible to say, have not changed after the foundation of Republic. Even the main concern of the leftist ones was the same with the Ottoman luminaries.(Melek Zorlu. "Tkp'den Tip'e Sol Kemalizm: Mdd Örneği" Unpublished MA Thesis, Ankara University, 2006.) Kemal Biilbaşar, as a matter of fact, as a leftist writer, who looks here 1337-38 from 1960s, still aims to maintain the prestige of the state/Atatürk who is the solution of the survival according to him.

[284] That emphasis is indicated by Ahmet İnsel in the frame of 'left Kemalism' as following: " The left Kemalism, attributes a progressivist mission as essential to a civil-martial layers which indepentent to the basic class. That layer, invariably was anti-emperalist, anti-feudal, even anti-capitalist." The equality discourse used in the novel, the anti feudal attidues, is obviously similar to the aproach of the writer as a leftist/Kemalist, Kemal Bilbaşar.

İnsel, Ahmet. 2001. "Giriş", Kemalizm: Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce, Cilt 2, (ed.) Ahmet İnsel, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, , s. 13-27. The original text is as following: "Sol Kemalizm, Türkiye'de temel sınıflardan bağımsız bir sivil-asker aydınlar katmanına özsel olarak ilerici bir misyon atfeder. Bu katman (...) sürekli olarak antiemperyalist, anti-feodal, hatta anti-kapitalisttir"

[285] İbid, pg.108. The original text is as following: "Bu ağaların şıhların satn alamayacağı adamlar göndermedikçe, onlara diş geçirmek mümkün olmayacak, dedi. Doğru dürüst konuşmasını beceremeyen ağalar şıhlar seyitler, okumuş efendi adamları ne eder de kandırırlar şaşarım. Hiç ummazsın, oysa bu herifler herşeyi duyarlar, bilirler, köylere kasabalara ağ kurmuşlar, anten çekmişler sanırsın. Kuş uçurmazlar."

[286] That point of view also coherent with Kemalist aproach to the people. The Kemalist ideology which motion is 'desipite the people, for people', actually bases on radical secularism, etnisist nationalism and authoriter-centralism and the 'populism' and the ' köycülük' (an ideological approach to the peasents and village including improvement, cultural reconstruction and introducing them as values of the country) which aim to disciplined/tamed to people, according to Mesut Yeğen. (Yeğen, Mesut. 2001. "Kemalizm ve Hegemonya?",

Although the mystical believes, the oral tradition and the folk culture of eastern people are thought to be authentic and valuable to them, even superior to the civilized west, their the knowledge about the real world is completely ignored and thought as a sign of savagery. The only way for the local people, to be accepted as civilized and have a worldview is by being dependent to the level of obedience to invasion of the power/state.

In a second stage, as a more civilized, lowland person Memo, depicts Cemo as an uncivilized, savage who needs to be educated by him. The novel creates a hierarchical situation between Dersimis. Memo, who is from region but not exactly from Dersim, becomes the leader of the resistance against the agha, because, he is more civilized then Cano, Cemo and all of the other 'mountain/highland people' who represent the Dersimis.

The authorial eye, besides giving orientalist images continuous to introduce Republic and its equality, classless, non-discriminatory 'notion'. Cemo, is from Dersim and she is Alevi. After Cemo and Memo get married, they settle into Memo's village that is Sunni. The other women of the village, behave very roughly and discriminate her due to her belief.[287] However, Memo's interpretation of this situation is very similar to his interpretation about the discrimination towards the Zazas in the military. According to Memo, the censure of being Qızılbash is an excuse/pretext, and in fact, they are jealous of her beauty. In other words, the authorial eye does not accept discrimination or cruel treatment coming from the Republic government or the conservative Sunnis towards the Dersimis. The only possibilities which can cause such unacceptable events, according to the text/novel, either arise from an individual fault/weakness or has an acceptable reason behind.

Kemalizm: Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce, Cilt 2, (ed.) Ahmet İnsel, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, pg 56-75.) Therefore, it is possible to point that, the ignorance discourse of Bilbaşar, stems from that approach which reflects the text as 'authorial eye'. That term will be used in this study as the reflection of ideological atittudes of the writers to the text.

[287] Bilbaşar, *Cemo*, pg.124. The original text is as following: "Kızılbaşın yunduğu yalak pis olur. Ha domuz, ha Kızılbaş."

In the meantime, the happiness of Cemo and Memo is taken away from them by the Sarikoğlu agha. The agha of the village of Cano is sold by the old agha to Sarikoğlu who has already had hostility against Cano and Memo. Memo tries to solve the problem of the village by applying to the governmental offices. An attorney, who promises to help them to cope with the problem, recommends them to apply to the *Vali* (governor of province). Memo tells his hesitation about not being allowed to go inside. The answer of attorney implies the discourse of Republic about peasants:

> "How did not they allow? You are the masters of the country, how would they dare?" [288]

The governor of the province, who is one of the 'good' examples of Republican governors, answers their question, and they become sure that Sarikoğlu is the new owner of the village of Cano. Some of the villagers decide to migrate to another village and seek refuge with another agha, and some of them decides to stay. Sarikoğlu, continues the imposition against Memo and his family to prevent the migration. At the same time, Memo sends a letter to his supportive commander for his help in finding a better agha and village. While waiting for an answer, the dialogue between Memo and Cano is a crucial evidence for understanding the intent of the text:

> "When we were in military services, they made us read and learn by heart, I said, in the borders of the Republic, every Turk was born and lives free. They are all theirs own masters. Then, for what, have so many people become slaves of agha wrongfully?

---

[288] İbid, pg.13. The original text is as following: "Nasıl komazlar? Siz memleketin efendilerisiniz, Ne hadlerine?" That sentence directly reminds the words of Atatürk "The real master of the country is the villager" which can be seen as the part of Kemalist modernization's search for a social base in the society. The Bolshevik and Kemalist inspiration of Kemal Bilbaşar, shows the most concrete example of his perception. Deprivation of the any class unity and organization, the villagers were declareted as the masters, in order to make the Kemalists masters because of the villagers' lack of conscious, dominance and any kind of rulling ability. Bilbaşar, that approach of Kemalist-Bolshevik view, therefore, applies here, with a villager's mouth. (Somay, Bülent"Türkiye Solunun Kemalizmle imtihanı"." *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce Cilt 8: Sol* (2007): 647-661, pg 653.)

> That method is made for the Ottomans. It is not appropriate for our place. In our place, the person who is born as a child of a slave, becomes a slave; the person who is born in the tent of an agha, sheikh becomes an agha, sheikh. There are people who are slaves but attempt to be an agha. However, this person should trust his gun and walk to the mountains. Otherwise, if you say I will both raise an animal and become an agha by producing goods, your work is useless. Any agha will tolerate one of his slaves who gains authority."[289]

In that dialog Memo tells the 'ideal' form and Cano tells the 'truth' of the region which is a part of the 'ideal' form. The whole structure of Dersim describes an eastern, peasant Memo: yet, hierarchically, Memo is in a higher position because he is both a lowland person (maybe even Sunni) and more civilized than the Dersimis in the subtext of the novel. Although the novel uses the local people who are telling their own story, it is obvious that, the reader is from the west. Memo and Cano are together as part of an imagination of east, and in another layer, the authorial eye by attributing an imagination to Memo about Cano and his culture makes Cano's existing more marginalized.

It is possible to say that the novel by marginalizing the Dersimis and also blaming them to be the ones responsible of that marginalization because of their uncivilized social structure conveys its message. The authorial eye by hiding itself and giving the words to the local people is supposed to be intimate and the announcer of the voice of the oppressed peasants. Yet, in this way the author/ the main narrator,who shows himself in the introductionary article of the novel outside of the text itself, makes a convenient point in order to legitimize/purify the approach of the Republic and Kemalist state.

---

[289]Bilbaşar, *Cemo,* pg. 155.The original text is as following: " -Bis eskeryedeyken okutup belletiler ki, dedim, Cumhuriyet sınırları içerisinde her Türk hür doğar hür yaşar. Başına buyruk olur. Madem öyledir, ne diye onca insan ağalara kulluk eder, nahak yere? (...) -O zagon Osmanlı için yapılmıştır. Bizim buralara uymaz. Bizim bu diyarda kul hayfasında doğan kul, ağanın şıhın otağında doğan ağa şıh olur. Kulun haymasında doğup ağalağıa yeltenen yok değildir. Velakin o kişi silahına güvenecek dağda gezecek. Yoğsam hem hayvanın kuyruğu dibinde gezer, hem de mal üretir ağa olurum dersen boşuna çalışırsın. Hiç bir ağa kullarının dişlenmesine göz yummaz."

Cemo's and Memo's different attitudes towards the state and its modern tools also show the approach against Dersim. When a document comes from the governmental offices, Cano's reflection is negative:

> "It had not seen any good news from the governmental documents, but does not break faith"[290]

However, this document comes from the supporter commander of Memo, who promises them to help in finding a place to settle. As a matter of fact, the government gives them a village which remains from the tribes who were exiled due to Sheikh Said rebellion. Yet again Cano, emphasizes that they are not capable to live without aghas/begs. Also, Cano argues with the other Dersimis about the credit and seed which the government gives them work in their new lands. The other peasants claims that the money coming from the government is "ominous" and the government does not give such amount of money to slaves like them. The defence of Cano is significant here:

> "What kind of things are you saying Cemşido? He said. Is there auspicious or ominous money? If there was an ominous money, it comes from the money gained with the brigandage, robbery."[291]

The life of Dersimis and the promised life by government are compared by Cano who is also from Dersim, and he prefers the government. As one of the main characters of the novel, in other words the person with whom the reader will feel empathy and sympathy prefers Mustafa Kemal's government.

By depicting a Dersimi like that the authorial eye aims to both talk on behalf of Dersimis and to make the Dersimis feel in that way by speaking on behalf of a Dersimi.[292] Also, it

---

[290] İbid, pg.165. The original text is as following: "Hükümat kâğıtlarından hayır çıktığı görülmemiştir a, niyetimizi bozmayak." That also aims to show the 'closness' of the writer to the peasents who can also 'criticise' the state. Yet it is obvious that, the writer, perceive such kind of problems either stemming from not sufficient governors or the fault of local powers.

[291] İbid, pg.175. The original text is as following: "Ne biçim bir sözdür bu Cemşido? Dedi, paranın uğurlusu uğursuzu ola? Uğursuzluk getirse, yol keserek adam soyarak toplanan para getirirdi."

convinces the reader about the local powers' responsibility about the losses and massacres. In addition to that, with the discourse of Cano as an 'intimate, brace, wise' character with whom a reader is supposed to empathize reaches its aim in the literary sense. Therefore, the function of Sarikoğlu is to represent an entire social structure of Dersim which means robbery, oppression and cruelty coming from the local powers towards the Dersimis. With the confirmation of Cano and his village, and the emphasis the tyranny of the Sheikh Said rebellion and the supporters the novel refers to the criminals of Dersim 1937-38 massacres. The ignorant people such as Velo Dayı, who believes that it is not possible to live without an agha and who represents the ignorant people of Dersim, is educated in text via the dialogs with Cano. It is obvious that, after meeting Memo who was educated in the military service, is also implied to be Sunni[293] and has a more civilized past, Cano changes and become the 'luminary' face of Dersim in the novel.

Memo and Cano's struggle against Sarikoğlu who becomes successful for a while, and they settle the in the new place. Memo in order to sell his bells, after solving the land problem with the help of the state, takes a trip via the roads around Dersim. The first observation of Memo is the thoughtful sight of the Dersimis towards construction of the roads. Also, one of Dersimis tells him to sell guns not bells. The Dersimi, explains the atmosphere to Memo, as following:

---

[292] Hamit Bozarslan indication about the discourse of Alevism of the offical aproach, actually occures here. Alevis are immagined as potential laic citizens of the new Turkish Republic and Bilbaşar, here tries to prove that apriach. (Bozarslan, Hamit. 2003. "Alevism and the Myths of Research: the need for a new Research Agenda" Pg 3-15 in White, Paul Joseph, and Joost Jongerden, eds. *Turkey's Alevi Enigma: A Comprehensive Overview.* Vol. 88. Brill, Pg 3)

[293] The character Memo is not from Dersim but around Murat river and when he takes Cemo to his hometown, the villagers does not accept Cemo easily becouse of her Alevism. The reactions of the villagers to the caming of Cemo is described by the writer as becouse she is a beautiful "highland girl". Instead of religgious difference the writer prefer to use that term in order to ignore the Alevi-Sunni difference as a politic issue. As a matter of fact, even the villagers humiliate Cemo by saying " it is same to be either a pig or a Qızılbash!", the writer finds a pretext, Cemo's beautiy to hide the discrimination towards Alevis. (Bilbaşar, *Cemo*, pg 124. The original sentene is following: Ha domuz ha kızılbaş!")

> "Dersimis suspect the Ottomans. The Ottomans who prepare to find a solution to take landform our hands, make roads with an aim. The state is decisive to send soldiers and eradicate us. The seyits are walking around by saying 'brace yourself'. The end of this process is darkness. You have come here in the bad times."[294]

The reflection of Memo to this explanation aims to remind of Sarikoğlu's cruelty. In other words, again there is emphasis on 'reality' of the seyits/aghas/sheikhsbeing responsible for this poverty, robbery, chaos.

As a matter of fact, Memo is attacked by Sarikoğlu's men in the meantime. The people from Senem's tribe, find Memo injured. After a long time of treatment Memo becomes better. Due to that event Memo and Senem come together again. However, Memo knows that he should go back to Cemo because Sarikoğlu could harm him. Senem and the other members of Senem's tribe ask him to not go because of danger by Ottomans.[295] According to them the Ottomans are planning to come to assimilate them and take their lands from them. Due to that picture, although the Republic wants to create an equal system and rescue the people from the 'tyrannical' spiritual and local leaders, these power groups manipulate the Dersimis to be against the state. However, the authorial eye does not take the peasants' concerns into consideration about the possible assimilation or discrimination because of their ethnic/religious and language difference. Although, the author does not underline that and tries to use that expression in order to prove his ideas, the thoughts of the peasants show the state's responsibility in the Dersim issue. In other words, the authorial eye introduces their concerns as a provocation of the seyits, aghas or begs. Yet, the words of the peasants make

---

[294] Ibid, pg.220.The original text is as following: "Dersimli osmanlıdan kuşkulanır. Zagon çıkarıp tüm topraklarımızı elimizden almağa hazırlanan Osmanlı, buraya yollarası boşuna döşemez. Leşker gönderip kökümüzü kazımağa niyetlidirç sıkı dırun der dolaşır seyitler. Bu gidişin encamı karanlıktır. Kötü zamanda gelmişssin kurban."

[295] 'Ottomans' means both the Ottoman state and the Turkish Republic after the foundation of it.

the authorial voice lower because there is not a defence of the author about the assimilation or disciplining and taming process which are in planning by the state.

When Memo goes to find Cano, he learns that Sarikoğlu organized entertainment with the kaymakam's placeholder, and Cemo is dancing at Sarikoğlu's home for them. Memo with his friend Cemşido go there, and Cemo kills Sarikoğlu. When the kaymakam's placeholder is threatened and asks them to not touch him, Cemşido's tirade is significant:

> "You, coward, he screamed, if you did know your masterfulness, we would respect you. You served a mean bastard of a supporter of Sheikh Said and besmirched the government of Gazi Paşalı. You made the homes of ghazis who served to Gazi Pasha, plundered, you devastated the family of them, you colluded the dying of the worldly wise ghazis in the mountains, and you beat the ghazis who came alive to death and sent [them] to jail, you attempt to their destroy privacy without honour. What you did, Yezid didn't do to Ali's slaves. You do not have the masterfulness title any more. Give the Ottoman seal back!"[296]

It is possible to point that, here, Cemşido transforms to the owner of the state from an ordinary peasants who judges the kaymakam for his betrayal to state and Gazi Pasha. By depicting the Kaymakam's placeholder as dishonest as possible, similarly to Sarikoğlu, the novel tries to find a balance. In other words, besides Sarikoğlu, Sheikh Said and his supporters, the local governmental officials composed the Dersim issue which consisted of robberies, brigandage and most importantly disobedience to the state.

---

[296]Ibid, pg. 227. The original text is as following: "Ula namert, sen efendiliğini bilmedin ki sana saygı gösterek. Bir alçak Şıh Sayıtlı'nın piçine hizmetkârlık edip, gazi paşalının hükumatına leke sürdün. Gazi paşalıya hizmet etmiş onca gazilerin obasını yağmalattın, çoluğunu çocuğunu perişan ettin, güngörmüş savaş gazilerini dağda, belde kurşunlamalarına göz yumdun, sağ dönenlerini sille tokat dama tıktırıp, namahremlerine hayâsızca el attın. Bu senin yaptığını yezit etmemiştir ali kullarına. Gayrı efendilik sıfatın kalmamıştır. Ver osmanlının mührünü"

The tragedy of the local people of being torn between the government officers and the local powers, prevented depicting the whole of Dersim as a 'boil'. Yet, it is possible to put the attitudes of the novel in the following frame: the authorial eye tries to hold the whole tragedy between 'bad governors,' 'the local powers who do not obey the state,' 'the ignorance of Dersimis who believe these manipulators' and 'the noble Dersimis who object local powers and obey the state.' By creating this table it becomes possible to legitimize the power and reproduce the Kemalist ideology. Also, by orientalising the Dersimis, the novelboth refuses subjectivity of the Dersimis and legitimizess the intervention, military manoeuvres, and creates an uncivilized, ignorant 'other' who needs to be educated by the Republic. Therefore, by blaming individuals and handling the problems as individual faults the novel entirely excludes the role of the state itself.

Memo volume 1

Kemal Bilbaşar's other novel to be be analysed is *Memo* that consists of two volumes published in 1968 and 1969. [297] Both volumes are based on the narration of the daughter of a sheikh, Senem. The narrator of the epilogue of the novel on the other hand, is a sub-lieutenant of the Hozat Mobile Gendarme Regiment, which is presented as one of the main guilty parties of the Dersim massacre in 1937-1938. The emphasis of the first novel, *Cemo* is about being ignorant, backward and the cruelty of the local leaders of Dersim.The second volume of Memoadds the gendarme factor as another dynamics of the Dersim 1937-1938 of a governmental weakness and the individual faults of governmental officers.

The novel begins with the preparation process of the Sheikh Said rebellion. The rebellion which is described in *Cemo* asa traumatic part ofthe childhood of Memo which causes him to become an orphan, again occurs in *Memo* 'sfirst volumefrom Senem's point of view. Yet, in

[297] In this study following issue will be used: Bilbaşar, Kemal. 1969-1970. *Memo* cilt 1-2. İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi.

Memo the 'ideology' and 'aim' of Sheikh Said is heard from his mouth with the direct speeches narrated by Senem. In other words, the authortries to convince the reader that the person who is talking there is himself, Sehikh Said and he is telling his 'real' ideas. With that, the authorial eye decelerates its 'objectivity' towards Dersim 1937-1938, throughout the novel.

Senem's father who is known as a rich, famous sheikh in Dersim is also invited to the rebellion by Sheikh Said himself and the other tribe leaders. For the rebellion, the Dersim tribes and Sheikh Said come together to make an oath taking ceremony. According to Senem, the arguments of Sheikh Said are the following: Kemal Pasha exiled the Caliph of the Muslims to the 'heathen' countries. Kemal Pasha, who comes from the *urum diyarı* (the realm of Rum), wants to have the Ottomans' throne and also has desires towards Kurdistan. He sees the sharecropper and the aghas as equals. He wants all the tribes to be obedient, pay taxes, and military service. And according to Sheikh Said, the claim of Kemal Pasha is unfair due to the fact that the British and the French reinforce them with money and guns.[298]

These arguments in the novel which supposed to belong to Sheikh Said are introduced as the reasons of the Sheikh Said rebellion. The two reasons of rebellion given here are very crucial. First one is the idea about the Caliph who is supposed to be not valuable for the Dersimis and the second is about the equality discourse which seems to be disturbing to Sheikh Said. The Caliph, who is known as the leader of the Muslim world, is not accepted by the Dersimis because of their Alevi belief. Yet, the aim of the novel is to show that there is a coherency between the new state and the Alevis who are both laic.

[298] İbid, pg. 32. That is actually aims to show the wiriter/Mustafa Kemal as equalitarian. Also, the reason behind the Dersim 1937-38, therefore, is implied as the desire of the sheiks, aghas, such as Seyit Rıza, for their personal penefits which eliminate any other dynamics behind the Dersim 1937-1938 massacre and prove the truthfulness of the state. In other word, the offical discourses on Dersim are repeated here from the mouth of Sheikh Said himself, which in fact aims to concinve the reader and show the thrutness of the offical discourses.

Sheikh Said, on the other hand is a 'reactionist' who wants the Sharia and identifies himself as an 'Islamic revolutionist'. [299] Moreover, the reader hears this idea from the mouth of Sheikh Said himself, and becomes convinced that Sheikh Said is both 'reactionary' and a 'tyrant,' who is against equality with ordinary people, and his only aim is to protect his status. The laicism and the equality discourse of the Republic, therefore, are reproduced here with the arguments of Sheikh Said.

The implication of the novel here can be pointed as the Republic as an equalitarian regime aiming to be destroyed by such danger as Sheikh Said, who is cruel and a follower of Sharia which is not really 'proper' for Dersim Alevis. In other words, with the mouth of Sheikh Said, the novel, strengthens the Republican discourse and constructs its ideology in the text. As a matter of fact, the long explanation of *azbet ağası* (leader of small groups) Halo as following, is very significant:

> "It is not for me to say that, the claims of Sheikh Said to be sultan of Kurdistan is good or bad. It is up to tribe leaders. If they say, he is the sultan, he becomes sultan. Yet, it is unfavourable for me to desire of Sheikh Said to rebel against Kemal Pasha because of the Caliph. This is a point worth stressing and it is not a necessary case for Dersim. What did Gazi Pasha do that makes us want to be against him? Do we want to advance on him because he downed the throne and raised the Ottoman sultan who has been wearing the Caliph's caftan since Yavuz and shed blood of the Alevis in Kurdistan? Does the brave men who are the enemy of our enemy a threat to us as an enemy? It is not a shame, I am unable to understand that... Sheikh Said prescribes that, Kemal Pasha has come from the urum realm, has disregarded Islam. Yet, I have heard that, Gazi pasha had posted the main law to the door of the state. The religion of our state is Islam' this is written in his law... He has reached further: Each human being can believe their own gods, No one can oppress any one because of beliefs! He has commended. So, he has released the Muslim, Christian, Sunni and Alevi in their religion. So, if the situation is that, for what reason we are rising against Kemal Pasha? Because he did not prohibit Alevism, we are trying to join the Sunni revolt and

[299] Sheikh Said rebellion as it is occured in the first novel Cemo, is repeated here only by adding Sheikh Said a chaaracter who tells his demends. That is functional to reach addresee and make the addressee believed that this are the 'real' tought of that historical figure.

desire to spill blood unjustly? I say that, our responsibility is to not rebel against Kemal Pasha, on the contrary, to send him gratefulness gift to him due to removing the ban on Alevism."[300]

The Sheikh Said rebellion which actually has nationalist aspects and, as explained in the second chapter, is a resistance towards the changing attitudes towards Kurds and Kurdistan, is introducing here exactly a reactionist and 'feudal' rebel. The disposition of the Dersimis which can be depicted as being neutral, to the Sheikh Said rebellion, with that argument, is based to the 'progressivist' laic government of Mustafa Kemal. In other words, the main acceptance about the relationship between the state, Ottoman/ Republic and the Dersimis is basically imagined upon a progressive perception of history.[301] Halo points that they suffered from the Ottoman Empire, and the Caliphs did not accept their belief and shedblood of the Alevis. On the contrary, Kemal Pasha is respectful to all religious and its believers. The laicism and nationalism notions of the Kemalist ideology, with this narration, are served by showing the 'unacceptable' ideas of Sheikh Said through 'naturally' the laic Alevis'. Beginning with *Cemo*, the authorial eye aims to show the 'real' face of Sheikh Said. The shadow of Sheikh Said, therefore, gains its character in *Memo*.

Also, in the novel, the 'foreign provocation,' which is a crucial part of the republican, discourse is repeated and accepted by the Dersimis, who are supposed to be in danger of being deceived:

---

[300] İbid, pg.33. The original text is as following: "Şıh Said'in Kürdistan padişahlığı davasına iyidir, kötüdür! Demek bana düşmez. Aşiret reislerinin bileceği iştir bu. Padişahtır! Derlerse padişah olur. Lakin Şıh said'in Halife yüzünden Kemal Paşa'lıya sancak açmak istemesi ters gelir bana... üzerinde durulacak bir taleptir bu ve de Dersim için gerekli bir dava değildir. Gazi paşa ne etmiştir ki sancak açıp karşısına dikilmek isterik? Yavuz'dan beri Halifelik kaftanı giyen, Kürdistan'da alevi kanı döken Osmanlı padişahına başkaldırdığı, tahtını devirdiği için mi üzerine yürümek isteriz? Hasmımıza hasımlık eden yiğit bize düşman ola? Ayıp değil, zihnime sığdıramazım bunu.. Şıh Sait buyurur ki, Kemal Paşa Urum diyarından gelmiş, islamı ayaklar altına almıştır. Oysa ben duymuşum ki Gazi Paşa, devlet kapısına ana bir zagon astırmıştır. 'Devletimizin dini islam dinidir.' Deyi yazdırmıştır zagonuna... Daha ileri varmıştır: Her kul kendi tanrısını kulluk ede, heç kimseye ibadetinden ötürü zulm edilmeye! Buyurmuştur. Yani ki Hristiyan'ı, Müslümanı, Sünni'yi Alevi'yi dininde serbest bırakmıştır. Böyle olanda biz Biz Kemal Paşalı'ya ne sebebe sancak açarık? Aleviliğe yasak koymadığı için mi Sünni halifenin davacılığına kalkarık, nahak yere kan dökülmesini isteriz? Ben derim ki bize düşen Kemal Paşalı'ya sancak açmak değil, Aleviliğe yasağı kaldırdığı için şükranlık armağan yollamaktır."

[301] For example, Mahmut Akyürekli indicates that, Dersimis did not know the reforms Republican regime brought due to the feudal leaders. (Akyürekli, 2011 pg.80)

"...the British provokes us to create trouble for the Ottomans, to dissuade Kemal Pasha from being a Kurdish supporter." [302]

Immediately after proving the 'foreigner provocation' of the rebellion, with the monologue Senem's uncle Seyit Reşo emphasizes the Turkishness of the Zazas in Dersim. Seyit Reşo points that they will neither raise against Kemal Pasha nor accept the claim of a Kurdish Sultanate. According to Seyit Reşo, because of their language--the Zazaki--it has become a 'tradition' to call them Kurdish but most of them are actually grandsons of Süleyman Şah.[303] In other words, the Dersimis are not Kurdish and Sunni, who have problems with the new Republic. Also, Seyit Reşo adds that he talked with Kemal Pasha in person, and he was convinced that Kemal Pasha is a brave man who does not make any discrimination to any ethnic origins or religion. Therefore, the Dersim tribes because of these reasons do not participate in oath taking ceremony of Sheik Said. Senem after pointing the opposed attitudes against Sheikh Said continuous to tell of what happened after the meeting. Some 'pillagers' tribes' leaders regret not being a part of the rebellion including Şıh Persin who will be the enemy of Senem and Memo in the rest of the novel.

The Dersim tribes who go after Sheikh Said, according to Senem, are the brigands and pillagers of Dersim. Also, Senem's father Şıh Abdo, following the advice of Huso, attacks the rebels' village, shoots Sheik Said in his back and announces to Gazi Pasha that they are loyal to him. However, after the execution of Sheikh Said, the sharecropper of Sheikh Said supporter, by following the advice of the seyits who supported Sheikh Said, blame Şıh Abdo to be the provoker of the rebellion. After the execution of Şıh Abdo, according to Senem,

---

[302] İbid, pg 35. The original text is as following: ".. İngiliz bizi ayaklandırır ki, Osmanlının başına gaile açıla; Kemal Paşalı'yı Kürt savunuculuğundan vazgeçire..."

[303] İbid, pg.37. Süleyman Şah is the grendfather of Osman Gazi who is the founder of Ottoman State. The explanation of the character about the ethnical origin of the Zazas is the official reaction of the state to the region. Prf. Besim Darkot, who was the founder of the 'national geography ', said that Dersimis are the mountain Turks, In the Ottoman period, they are called entirely Kurds and they had become Kurds not because they were Kurd; but because of calling them Kurds in time. The official nationalist approach towards Dersim, therefore, is reproducing here by a Dersimi local leader to convince the addressee by the wirter. Dersim (Bora, Tanıl. "1930'lardan 1950'lere Resmi Milliyetçiliğin Dersim'e Bakışı: Asimilasyonizmin Kırılganlığı." in Zeliha Hepkon, Songül Aydın and Şükrü Aslan. 2013. *Dersim'i Parantezden Çıkarmak.* İstanbul: İletişim. Pg 77-96)

Kemal Pasha starts to perceive them as an enemy. A group of gendarme, with the pretext of collecting guns attack their tents and also terrorize Dersim.[304]

In the narration of Senem there are some significant points. Firstly, by highlighting the regret of the 'robber' and 'brigand' tribe leaders to not participating in the rebel it is implied that Sheikh Said and his supporters are in that way. Secondly, the atitudes of the 'changing' perceptionof the state towards Dersim is also connected to the Sheikh Said rebellion. In other words, it is possible to assume that the novel with such implications step by step constructs its discourse and under the shadow of that ideology points at the 'responsible/guilty' of Dersim 1937-1938 massacre.

Back to the plot, Senem's uncle Seyit Reşo, sells Senem's mother to Şıh Persin. Şıh Persin, who introduced as a plunderer is also the 'viper's nest' of the novel. Senem tells the 'secrets' behind Şıh Persin when she talks about this marriage. In the future, Senem's learns that he is the person who caused his father's death in order to be the leader of the tribe.

As a matter of fact, Şıh Persin as the hatred object of the narrator, is depicted as a very cruel, tyrannical character. He does not accept to be equal with the sharecroppers. For axample, when Huso gives them some meat, he shouts to Huso and says that too much meat can demoralize these 'dogs'. Also, after Senem's resistance to kissing his hands, he shouts as following:

> "Do not cloth this stubborn girl with the male caftan any more... Let her know that she is a female so that she does not pretend to be male and sit right beside her mother."[305]

---

[304] Bilbaşar, sings Sheikh Said, as the 'basic' responsible of whole process experienced in Dersim. Although, according to writer Kemal Pasha is perfect, becouse of bad behaviours of Sheikh Said, or the other local leaders who stand against him, spoiled the relationship. Yet, although the wirter points that, throughout the novel, as it is obvious here, execpt the state itself who is actually Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, anybody can be the responsible of the persecution of the state towards Dersim. In other words, the wirter, try to protect the image of Atatürk and 'republic' although he is aware of the massacres in the region at that time period.

The words of Şıh Persin show that he on the contrary to Senem's father has a male dominant point of view. In other words, the state supporters are merciful, egalitarian and 'proper' to be 'civilized' by the state; yet, the supporters of the rebels, the non-submissive leaders or ordinary people are cruel, tyrants, sexists.[306] The savageness of the Şıh Persin's men, shows the authorial attitudes towards Dersimis:

> "Şıh Person's men were trueborn robbers. They were carrying bandoleer on their half-naked chests. They looked unkept. They tied two huge shoulder belts. Also, green-blue beads made by turtle bone were hanging to their esters of chest."[307]

The description here, matches the orientalist view of the authorial eye. The nakedness, bone made trappings, the wild appearance all can be seen as the implications of savageness that is attributed to the Dersimis in the text.

In addition to that, the education service of the state "Girls' Institutes" opened in the late 1920s[308]was also 'manipulated' by Şıh Persin in order to get rid of Senem. The female teacher who goes from one tribe to another to gather girls in order to educate them in Dersim, according to Senem, is very innocent and a pure minded person who was manipulated by Şıh Persin. Şıh Persin tells them that he promises to that teacher to give Senem an education. When Huso hears that he objects Şıh Persin and says that it is impossible to them to give their

---

[305] İbid, pg. 44. The original text is as following: "Bu inatçı kancığa er kaftanı giydirmeyin bundan böyle... eysik etek olduğun bile ki, erlik taslamaya ve de anasının dizinin dibinden ayrılmaya"

[306] The writer, in other words, does not seize any opportuntiy to Show the 'bigotry' and 'backwardness' of 'rebels' of the Dersim in addition to their 'evil' characters. It is also coherent the discourse on Alevis about being more 'proper' to republic regime if they can eliminate these not proper members of them.

[307] İbid, pg.44. The original text is as following: " Şıh persinin adamları su katılmamış uğru idiler. Yarı çıplak göğüslerinde çapraz fişeklik taşırlardı. Saçı sakalı birbirine karışmıştı. Boyunlarına birer iri hamaylı bağlamışlardı. Esterlerinin göğsünde de, tospa kemiği yeşil mavi boncuklar asılıydı."

[308]Education in 'Multicultural' Societies – Turkish and Swedish Perspectives,eds. Marie Carlson, Annika Rabo and Fatma Gök, Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, Transactions, vol. 18 (Stockholm 2007), pp. 93-105.

children to the Ottomans and allow them to learn Ottoman culture.[309] The defence of Hus, is actually a resistance to the state in the assimilation of the Dersimis. Yet, there is no objection towards the teacher who supports Kemal Pasha in collecting girls.On the contrary, she is drawn as an 'innocent' person who is deceived by Şıh Persin.

The text, in a way, creates a paradoxical situation. The sadness of Senem about being sent to school, the objections of Huso to acceptance of Ottomanization (in fact Turkification), the aim of the state in collecting girls are not able to constitute a problemor being interrogated by the auther in the novel. Regardless of any paradoxicalambiguities in the text, the guilty are clearlythe local leaders of Dersim according to the novel.

In the meantime, Senem grows up and faces the danger of having to marry a rich sheikh from Diyarbakır. However, at the same time, she meets Memo and falls in love with him. The first appearance of Memo, in the novel also happened because of the plots of Şıh Persin. By cooperating with a Hanafi agha; Osman Nur and Şıh Persin set a trap to dishonour the Senem. Osman Nur agha proposes Memo to go to Senem's room where he plans take his revenge. However, Memo does not accept that and coincidently comes to Senem's village and tells the whole story to them. They realize that, this is the plan of Sheikh Persin. Senem and Memo, in the meantime, fall in love to each other. Memo asks for permission to marry Senem, but Şıh Persin does not allow them. After this point Şıh Persin becomes hostile towards Memo.

Firstly, he informs against Memo to the gendarme caliming that he is provoking some tribes in Dersim against Kemal Pasha. Yet, with the help of the gendarme Ali, Memo is rescued from that situation. The storyline which is followed in the novel *Cemo*, is repeated here from the point view of Senem. After the news about Memo, Şıh Persin continues his plans.

[309] Ibid, pg.56.

Şıh Persin claims that he has the village's certificate of ownership confirmed by the pasha of Elazığ. Huso's answer is vital to analyses the confused mind of the authorial eye[310]:

> "Is it possible to fit the Ke..lands to a certificate? Who is the pasha of Elazığ, while paying no attention to the custom and rules of Dersim, make our tent, our land which are our heirloom, wealth to you and make slaves of the aghas sharecroppers of that to you?"[311]

Senem again informs the reader the secret behind that situation. Şıh Persin by paying a bribe to some governmental officers and to the lawyers gets the certificate. The tyranny of Şıh Persin with the support of pasha, who is actually not aware of the 'real face' of Şıh Persin, becomes more powerful. Senem, in the meantime is sold to an Arabic Şıh Abuzer. The life condition of the place where Senem is brought is depicted as slavery especially for women. Also, related to honour the stoning of a women to death is depicted in describing this 'Arabic' place/culture.[312] Therefore, the rules of Arabic places, are also narrated in a very orientalist way, and by that, there is an implication on the civilization which the Republic promises.

Yet, as part of the fate, a coincidence brings the old lovers Memo and Senem together. The commander of Memo brings Memo to Şıh Abuzer's villa. Memo and Senem find each other

---

[310] That is actually the sign of 'danger' of the local leaders which can even deceive the government. Kemal Bilbaşar, shows his reaction to the 'feudal' structure in that way. Because the regulation of land, according to writer is a 'socialist' act of the state who want to save the 'Anatolian peasants'. The Kemalist ideology's notion which separates society two fragment: The laic, councious, Kemalist part and the uncouncious mass who dominated with supersitions and need custodian. As the 'leader' of the society, Bilbaşar, depicts the local leaders as the enemy of the society who should be removed in the frame of a social engineering. The populist discourse here, also stem from the search of Kemalist modernization to find a social base and which it is in fact an elitist version of populism. "Halka ragmen halk için" (Despite the people, for the people) therefore, is the motion of this populism.
(Somay Bülent" Türkiye Solunun Kemalizmle imtihanı".*Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce Cilt 8: Sol* (2007): 647-661. Pg 653)

[311] İbid, pg.113. The original text is as following: "Ke... uşağınn toprağı heç tapuya sığa? Elaziz Paşası kim ola ki, Dersim örfünü töresini çiğneyerek, ecdat yadigarı obamızı mezramızı sana mal; ağasını marabasını sana kul ede?"

[312] The Alevism culture, was evalutaed as the protector of 'real Turkishnes' agianst to Arabic culture by the republican elites, the folcloric researches about Alevis were also in that frame. Bilbaşar, who indicates that he made researches on the culture of Dersim before writing his novels, as it is obvious, uses that frame here. (Küçük, Murat. "Türkiye'de Sol Düşünce ve Aleviler"*Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce Cilt 8: Sol* (2007):896-935. Pg.902.)
"...Alevilerin Türk benliğini tarih boyunca Arap ve Acem hırsına karşımuhafaza ettiğine dair ki alevilere

again and promise each other to meet in Diyarbakır where Memo is a soldier. Although Senem succeedsin running away, she gets arrested by Şıh Abuzer. The son of Şıh Abuzer, Seyyit Vahhap who also wants Senem, abducts her and tells everyone that Senem has drowned herself to Dicle River. Sofi, one of the Vahhap's men rescues Senem and kills Vahhap. After these events Senem, reaches her hometown Dersim.

When Senem returns to Dersim, she realizes that the problem with Şıh Persin is not solved.Also she learns that he is the responsible of all the past crimes such as killing her father. Sofi announces that he will kill Şıh Persin. Huso objects to him. Accoridng to Huso, it is not possible to cope with his power due to the fact that he pretends to be supporter of Kemal Pasha and manipulates that situation. Also, Şıh Persin is a good person in the eye of government because he is the person who also allows the state to build gendarmes' forts in his village, sends the children to the school of the state. Şıh Persin is a wealthy man, which makeshim capable of manipulating all kind of institutions/persons and even the government.

As the 'evil' character, Şıh Persin learns Sofi's aim and kills him. Senem, in order to not be captured by Şıh Persin, takes a refuge in the Demenan tribe. Seyit Reşo, who is at the highest level of Seyit rank of Dersim, also supports Senem. With the leader of Demen Şıh Cebrail, Seyit Reşo refuses the demand of Şıh Persin to give back Senem to him.The agent men tells that the new law that the Ottomans brought here is for children to be with their parents until the age of eighteen. Şıh Persin, again by manipulating this law wants Senem back.[313] Seyit Reşo sends the agent men back and does not give Senem to them. After that Şıh Persin and Seyit Reşo become more aggressive towards each other.

Senem and her men attack to Şıh Persin's home, but Şıh Persin takes Senem's mother and runs away. After that, Senem asks the people to come with them. However, some of them are

[313] The writer tries to Show that the low/the civilized state and society is perfect, yet the evil feudal leaders even manipulated them which makes them more and more dangerous for 'pure'/'ignorant Dersimis.

employed by the Ottomans to work on the railway construction; the remaining depart with Senem. Şıh Persin, in the meantime, complains to the pasha of Elazığ about Şıh Cebrail, the leader of Haydaran Şıh Kamer and Seyit Reşo but the pasha does not want to have a conflict with the most powerful leaders of Dersim.

After Sheikh Said is depicted as a fictional character, the leader of Demanan Cebrail and the leader of Haydaran Kamer, until now, do notappear in the novel. They are with Seyit Reşo who is a fictional character and who represents the powerful leaders of the Dersim tribes. Yet the position of Seyit Reşo, in this flow of events, is matched to the paradoxical point of view of the authorial eye. One hand Seyit Reşo by showing the photography taken in Sivas with Mustafa Kemalconvincesthe agent about his loyalty to the Ottomans,while on the other hand he does not accept the state's behavior. The authorial eye, it is possible to say, at some point tries to distinguish Mustafa Kemal fromthe state. In other words, even the 'rebels' who do not compound with the state trust Mustafa Kemal. The subtext here is that the civilization and the ideology which Mustafa Kemal created is free from all defects; yet, when they are applied, the officers, the individuals etc. can harm his pure notion. In other words, the civilization comes from the 'blue eyed, blond haired' Mustafa Kemal, andhe is the real rescuer: no trouble can ever stem from him.

Back to the plot, in the meantime, Senem tries to find Memo, but she does not find any news from him. She has his baby and names him also Memo. When little Memo becomes around two years old, Senem describes the developments in Dersim. The pasha of Elazığ opens roads through Dersim and makes bridges on the Sin gate and Harçik stream. Senem, as narrator, continuous to describe the process:

> "Not long after, Dersim begun to simmer sneakingly... The seyits who were going one tent to other, were walking around making the people concerned for their lives and properties, they said that the Ottomans made a law to eradicate

> the structure of Dersim, they changed the name of the place of Şıh Hasan, Şah Hızır to Tunceli, made it a province, and bound it to Ankara, the tyrant, cruel pasha of Elazığ was appointed as governor of the province, the Pasha massed soldiers to Pülür, they will attack Dersim in the early days of spring. Some poor people, were selling their property and animals in the bazaar and investing the money to the gun."[314]

Here, the authorial eye makes an emphasis on the function of the seyits of provocation of the Dersimis. The state is doing some 'developments,' and that is misread by the seyits: because of their wrong perceptions, some 'poor,' 'helpless' people buy gun instead of food.

Even, the uncle of Senem, Seyit Reşo, who is described as having 'respect' for Mustafa Kemal, decides to rebel against the state. It is significant that from now on, Seyit Reşo, seems to turn on Seyit Rıza[315]:

> "The reason behind the Pasha's building of roads and bridges becomes obvious by fining our sharecropper for not speaking in Ottoman Turkish, in the bazaars. His desire is to restructure us. That is the award of trusting Gazi Pasha, and to not leave from loyalty. By saying, unfortunately, the fidelity had not gotten valuable in the world, he pulled the souvenir photo from Sivas, downed it from wall."[316]

With these words Seyit Reşo shows the closeness of Dersim 37-38. The state, which was trusted before, according to him, has changed its approach and aims to eradicate their own structure. The perception of the Dersimis about such developments as roads, bridges, schools

---

[314]İbid, pg.251. The original text is as following: "Çok geçmeden, dersim alttan alta kaynamağa başladı... Oba oba dolaşan seyitler, Osmanlının dersim nizamını kökünden kaldırmağa zagon çıkardığını, Şıh Hasan'ın, Şah Hızırın diyarını Tunceli adıyle il edip Ankara'ya bağladığını, başına Elazız Paşasını, astığı astık kestiği kestik vali getirdiğini, paşanın Pülür'e leşker yığdığını evvel baharda Dersim'e saldıracağını söyler gezerler, kulları can mal kaygusuna düşürürlerdi. Biçarelerin kimi malını davarını panayıra indirir satar, parasını tüfenge kurşuna yatırırdı.

[315] Although the other famous leaders of 1937-38 are appearing as characters, the writer prefer to not use the name of Seyit Rıza but draws Seyit Reşo in order to represent him not in a clear frame but in an ambiguity.

[316]İbid, pg.252.The original text is as following: "paşanın yolları, köprüleri ne sebebe kurdurduğu pazara inen marabamıza Osmanlıca konuşmazlar deyi ceza kesilmesinden bellidir. Bizi kökten değiştirmektir muradı. Bunca zaman Gazi Paşa ya güvenip sadakatten ayrılmamızın mükafatı bu olmuştur. Ne yazık dünyada anda vefanın bir değeri kalmamıştır, diyerek Sivas yadigarı resmi çekmiş, indirmiş."

here is obviously defined as a policy of assimilation. The authorial eye tries to show that the objection is only about the spiritual and local leaders' desire to protect their statues.

As a matter of fact, Seyit Reşo, recommends to Senem to marry a man from a powerful tribe in order to be more powerful against the state. He organizes a competition to choose a husband for Senem, and coincidentally, that night Memo comes, and they come together again. Memo, on the contrary to Seyit Reşo, from now on becomes an 'luminary' face of the republic and tries to convince Senem and her tribe not to be part of this rebellion. When Huso tells about their conversation with their lawyer about the right of Senem, Memo's answer shows the role of Memo:

> "I do not trust your attorney. He is either ignorant, or a coward. If he was a good attorney, he would not dread the Pasha, by knowing the Ottoman law gives the right of legacy to the daughter too, would sue on behalf of Senem, and at least would take some of land from the robbers' hand." [317]

The passage shows that Memo as a peasantinteriorizes the rules of the modern state and trusts the law that Kemal Pasha has established. According to Memo anattorney that does not fight against aghas/sheikhs is not a proper, wise citizen of the country. Memo as a peasant attributes the kinds of people who are a part of bureaucracy to a challenging mission towards the 'enemy' of the republic. In that context the dialog between Huso and Memo about the present situation of Dersim makes the function of Memo as a protagonist clearer. Huso claims that the aim of state in making bridges and roads is to change the structure of Dersim and to Ottomanize/Turkificate the Dersimis. However, Memo does not accept this argument and answers him:

> "I do not understand that. You are talking as if Dersim is the place of infidels.And there is something else that the state does not open roads only in

[317] İbid, pg.263The original text is as following: "başvurduğunuzu avukatı gözüm tutmamıştır. Ya bilgisiz ya da yüreksiz biriymiş. Eğerçe iyi bir abukat olsa, Paşa'dan yılmaz, Osmanlı zagonunun kız evlada da mires yeme hakkı tanıdığını bilip, Senem adına dava açar, heç olmazsa obanın bir bölük toprağını uğrının elinden kurtarırdı."

> the Dersim province. The road is also open, the bridges are constructed in the lowland provinces. Yet it has not seen that anybody forced a village as saying 'You will change your rules!' What I think is that the Pasha has roads, bridges constructed for the good of Dersim, but you feel malevolence, suspect in vain by believing the rumours."[318]

The crucial subtext here is the debate on the ownership of Dersim. Is Dersim a separated place which the state/ Mustafa Kemal wants to annex or has it been a part of the state but needs to be reconstructed? Although the authorial eye portrays Memo as the hero/wise character, who should have the empathy of the reader, the idea of Huso, he shows that the experiences of the people indicate that Dersim is a seprate place.[319]

Huso as a local person of Dersim does not attach himself to the remaining of the country.Even the sentence itself deconstructs the aim of the writer and shows the other side of the picture. The remaining part of the dialog becomes more interesting. Huso is not pleased about Memo's supportive attitude towards the state and says that because of previous experiences, they expects badness from all the works of the Ottomans. Again, the answer of Memo emphases the Turkishness of the Dersimis which is supposed to make them united:

> "Why do the two branch of a tree behave as an enemy to each other? Are not the Dersimis from the Kayı village?"[320]

---

[318]İbid, pg.264. The original text is as following: "Töbe aklım almamıştır bunu. Dersim sanki gâvur diyarıymış gibi konuşursun. Şu da var ki, Osmanlı salt dersim iline yol açtırmaz... düzün onca ilinde de demiryolları döşenir köprüler kurulur, lakin hiçbir obanın köyün 'örfünüzü değiştireceksiniz!' diye zorlandığı görülmemiştir. Bana şöyle gelir ki, paşa, yolu köprüyü dersimin hayrına yaptırır da siz söylentilere kapılıp, ardında kötü niyet sezinleyerek, boşuna kuşkulanırsınız."

[319] Although the writer tries to prove the wrongness of that although, the text, with even having this argument for refuting it, opens a way to think different from the offical discourse. That is also the reason behind the critics in Barbaras Baykara's novels *Dersim 1937, Tunceli 1938*towards Bilbaşar'snovels without naming. These critics, which is actually targeting Bilbaşar's novel because of that kind of explanations such as Huso's words against the state, are actually 'blurting' according to Baykara including the Bilbaşar's novels' negaitve attitude towards gerndarme.

[320] İbid, pg.269. The original text is as following: "Aynı ağacın iki dalı birbirine düşman ola? Dersimli de Kayı köyünden değil midir?"

Memo, claims and tries to convince them that the Ottomans/Turks and the Dersimis belong to same origin. Huso, who is not pleased by the previous explanation of Memo, confirms the 'common origin' claim. Yet, he adds that Kemal Pasha promised them to not exposethem to discrimination, and based on this promise they fought against Sheikh Said. Yet, according to Huso, the main law of Kemal Pasha was not enforced and the Ottoman elites who know them as Kurdish despise them and censure their rules and forced them to not speak their language. He finally highlights that if the law was enforced they could forget every fight and live in peace. Huso's words show how the Dersimis trust the Republic. Memo, because of being a stranger to Dersim, does not know how to answer him. The authorial eye through that dialog forms a relationship between the republic and the Dersimis. According to this formation, the Dersimis are proper and willing to be Republican; however, because of the local leaders such as the Şıh Persin or the provoker seyits and the ignorant, 'heartless' luminaries/educated people such as the attorney and degenerated governmental officers the law of Mustafa Kemal fails to be upheld.

Back to the plot, Memo and Senem begin to live in Senem's tribe. The people of the tribes, whose land is captured by Şıh Persin, come to Senem and Memo and ask for permission to attack Şıh Persin. Memo, as a 'wise' leader, says that because the documents of Şıh Persin are legal it is not possible to attack him. In case of that, the tribe will be punished not by Şıh Persin but the state for breakingthe law. Memo, adds that there is a hidden reality that tribes do not know. The law of the state, according to Memo, is not similar to the rules of the tribes:the daughter also has the right of succession. Memo recommends to go to court in order to get the rights back without harming anyone. When some of the people warn Memo that Şıh Persin has important supporters such as pashas or attorneys. Memo indicates that he also has a supporter that has even respect of Gazi Pasha. The decisive people accept the suggestion of

Memo by adding that if the suggestion of Memo would not solve the problem, they will attack as the least resort.

The first implication of the authorial eye is that the Dersimis are not informed of the superiority of the state rules over theirs. The state treats man and woman as equals, and the Dersimis do not know that. Also, again, the Turkish Republic has honourable people who will make the best of the republic, butthe degenerate people harm their credibility. Lastly, the Dersimisprefer the legal framework if it does not go beyond their power. The admiration of Memo by the people also shows that the Dersimis will not disobedient, if the state can be able to bring 'consciousnesses' to them. The colonialist perspective of the novel, therefore, shows itself through leaks of the text. The difference between the west and east, or between Dersim and Ankara, is depicted both as Edward Said recommended 'epistemological' and 'ontological'[321] terms. The eastern 'mountain' peoples simply do not have enough knowledge and subjective existence. The subjectivity and the knowledge that the Dersimis do not have can only be given by the state. Therefore, Memo who has the knowledge of superiority of the Republic becomes a 'natural' leader of the other local people.

In order to solve the land issueSenem and Memo go to Elazığ to military barrack commander of which is the person who supported Memo when he was at military service. Memo goes to the commander's room and the first reaction of commander is significant:

> "Memo, my son, have you come? I would not recognize you in the costume of bashibazouks… You are welcome!"[322]

The clothes of Memo are uncivilized, undisciplined and make him far from his individuality, according to commander that almost fails to recognize him. The appearanceof Memo that the state/ the commander accept consists of the 'civilized' military clothes which distinguish him

[321] Said, Edward. 1979. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage. Pg. 3.
[322] İbid, pg.293. The original text is as following: "Vay memo, sen mi gelmişsin evlat? Başıbozuk kılığı içinde az kalsın tanıyamazdım seni.. Hoş gelmişssin, safalar getirmişsin!"

from the disobedience/uncivilized people of the region. Also, the symbol of that civilization, Kemal Pasha himself, is introduced as a person who spreads 'majesty' from his eyes.

Senem who begins to learn the 'civilization' from Memo, latterly, learns that the 'magnificent' man in the picture is Mustafa Kemal. In that meeting Memo tells the problems that Senem's tribe experienced because of Şıh Persin, and warns the commander that, if they could not solve the problem, the people would hold the pasha of Elazığ responsible. Also, according to Memo, if this problem could be solved, the name of the *paşamız* (our pasha) will be cleared. As a matter of fact, the commander helps them and directs them to an attorney NusretBey. The real thought of the pasha of Elazığ appears with the explanation of Nusret Bey. The pasha of Elazığ, according to Nusret, has never helped Şıh Persin, but Şıh Persin pretended to be supported by him in order to suppress the peasants.

When the trial day comes, Şıh Persin first tries to prove that Senem is dead. When the witness of Senem become successful in proving that she is Senem herself, Şıh Persin calls Senem's mother. Senem's mother confirms Şıh Persin's claim, but after Senem's talk she regrets it. At that time, gun shots are heard and Senem's mother is shot dead. During the chaos, Şıh Persin leaves the court and escapes. Yet, the judge understands that Şıh Persin is responsible of those events and gives Memo and Senem their right.

Senem and Memo, come to village and tell the situation to Huso and the other members of the tribe. However, Huso is not pleased with the result. His explanation directly refers to the process of Dersim 1937-1938:

> "The robber who is given a hard time, will go to mountains and will pretend as if he is oppressed. He will get help from the tribes, also he will not be captured easily. The intervention of the Ottoman is not good. The bloodthirsty robber, will be supported

like a persecuted slave. I am afraid that, with the sedition of Şıh Persin, tribes will resist the gendarmes."[323]

By connecting the resistance of the tribes against the state to the Şıh Persin, the responsible of Dersim 1937-1938 has been put on either the state that is represented byMustafa Kemal, or the 'brave', 'honest' people of Dersim who are very loyal to the state such as Memo, Cano, and the other 'good' Dersimis. The *çıban*(boil) metaphor about Dersim which is depicted in the reports of the state, is represented here as Şıh Persin. Therefore, it is possible to point that, the target of the state and the authorial eye match in a way. Memo, in the meantime, goes to the commander and asks permission to find Şıh Persin by themselves in order to prevent seditions. With the permission of the commander, Memo and Seyit Reşo, catch Şıh Persin and when they deliver him to the gendarme, the peasants lynch him with the leadership of Elif Ana (mother Elif).

The symbolic death of Şıh Persin completes the closure message of the novel. The peasants and the Dersimis are aware of their 'real' enemy who is the cruel sheikhs, aghas etc. and they, if needed, will kill them with their own hands. Memo, who is the leader of that process and the supporter of the Republic, at the end of the*Memo*'s first volume, earns to be Seyit—arerespected person among the Dersimis. In other words, Memo being the 'agent' of the state also wins the approval of the Dersimis, which means the people accept the rule of the civilized power, the Turkish Republic, which belongs to Mustafa Kemal, instead of the 'uncivilized,' 'savage,' 'bloody' rule of Dersim.

Memo volume 2

[323]İbid, pg 294.The original text is as following: "Üzerine varılan harami dağa çıkacak, mazlum postuna bürünecektir. Aşiretlerden yardım görecek, kolay kolay da ele geçmeyecektir. Osmanlı'nın işe karışması heç iyi olmamıştır. Hunhar uğrı, zulüm görmüş kul gibi arkalanır bundan böyle. Korkarım ki, Şıh Persin'in fitnesiyle aşiretler cendermeye karşı dururlar."

The beginning of *Memo*'s second volume, adds a new aspect to the hero Memo.[324] When Senem prays to Tujik[325], Memo in a sarcastic way implies his suspicious about the sacredness of the mountain and adds that she is a better 'god' to worship. The scientific approach of Memo towards the Senem's belief can be seen as another step of bringing Republic and Memo closer. As a new seyit, Memo is depicted as laic and a rationalist to portray him as a better representation of the enlightened Republic. As an interesting aspect, the present belief system is acceptable but it is not valid which is implied in the sarcasm of Memoand in fact by the authorial eye.[326] Memo as a more modern, laic person, therefore, leads the people.

The dead body of Şıh Persin should be delivered to the commander. Memo takes the dead body and heads to Elazığ. The commander and the pasha of Elazığ congratulate Memo for catching Şıh Persin, whom the gendarme failed to arrest. The pasha adds that they have their lands back,and they should be shared among their people. Afterwards, the pasha begins to tell what he wants to do in Dersim. The aim of the Republic according to the commander is to clean Dersim from brigandage and robbery. The land law which will be made by the parliament will giveto the Dersimis the lands which the aghas and sheikhs do not give voluntarily. Memo in that context has the following missions, according to the pasha:

> "Do your best, go and deliver the lands and make each of them as honourable citizens! Protect them from the greedy sheikh, agha and seyit! Send the babies to school, make the women knit, textile! When you do that, the help of the Ottomans will be with your tent."[327]

---

[324] Bilbaşar, Kemal.1970. *Memo*. İkinci cilt. İstanbul: Tekin. The following edition will be used in this study: Kemal Bilbaşar. 1969-1970. Memo. İstanbul: Tekin.

[325] A sacred mountain in the Alevism.

[326] Kemal Bilbaşar, as a member of Türkiye İşçi Partisi (Turkey Worker's Party), approachs Alevism in a pragmatic way and connects Alevism, with Kemalism and his leftist view.Küçük, Murat. "Türkiye'de Sol Düşünce ve Aleviler" *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce Cilt 8: Sol* (2007):896-935. Pg. 905.

[327]İbid, pg. 20. The original text is as following: " Göreyim seni, oba halkına toprağı komu dağıtıp onları namuslu birer vatandaş yapasın! Gözü doymaz şıhlara, ağalara, seyitlere karşı onları gözedesin!... Bebelerini okudasın, kancıklarını örgüye dokumaya oturdasın! Bunu yapanda Osmanlı'nın yardm eli obandan eksik olmayacak."

In order to manufacture a 'citizen' disciplining Dersim is the main target of the state according to the pasha's words. The Dersimis, who are not 'honourable' and not 'citizens' yet should be immediately made both citizen and honourable.[328] The children should take education from the state schools, women should learn some workmanship with this education of modernization, and then they will be the real citizens of the Republic. Also, all these missionsare the duty of Memo, who has already become the enlightened face of the Republic among the savage, uncivilized Dersimis. With the authority that the state guaranteed to him and since the tribe is ready/volunteer to be civilized by the state Memo asks to take back the sharecroppers of the tribe from the construction sites. The pasha firstly hesitates to do so but Memo says that the tribe needs them to build itself and to realize hisdemands. The demand of Memo accepted, and a feast is organized for him by the pasha. During the feast, according to the narrator Senem, the pasha 'praises Memo to the skies'. The content of that praise is as following:

> "Memo, who trained in Diyarbakır's military service is a brave man that is loyal to the nation and state. He rescued the sharecropper of K..uşağı from the persecution of a robber sheikh. He promised to take gun form the slaves and give excavation to them. Ke..uşağı will be a model for all the other tribes, this brave man will open the doors of the brace of Dersim to civilization. I hope, at the earliest time, we will see the eradication of brigandage rules from there, and the establishment of the Republican rules, which is based upon the rights, fairness."[329]

---

[328]Türkyılmaz, Zeynep. 2001. "Nationalizing through Education: The Case of 'Mountain Flowers' at Elazığ Girls' Institute." Unpublished Master's Thesis. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University. Pg 74-56.

[329]İbid, pg.23. The original text is as following: "Diyarıbekir esker ocağında yetişmiş, millete devlete sadık bir yiğittir. Ke..uşağı marabasını bir harami şıhın zulmünden kurtarmıştır. Kulların elinden silahı alıp kazmayı vermeğe söz kesmiştir. Ke..uşağı tim aşiretlere örnek olacaktır, bu yiğit Dersim'in kapılarını medeniyete açacaktır. Tez zamanda şekavet nizamının köklendiğini, hakka adalete dayanan cumhuriyetin nizamının orada yerleştiğini görürük işallah."

It is obvious that the 'praise' is actually a 'bravo' to a 'civilized' savage that will help to civilize others. The educating/civilizing school of the state is barracks of compulsory military service. Also, the characteristic of being a good/brave man is tied to being loyal to the nation and the state. Memo as a loyal/obedient person to the state by *de facto* becomes a brave, powerful, honest man whose mission is to bring 'conscious', 'civilization' to the inner Dersim. In other words, as a man who 'rescued' himself from the 'robber' structure of Dersim and is on the side ofthe state, Memo deserves the praise of the commanders and has to support the taming of Dersim. The opposition to excavation and guns, is also an evidence of the orientalist discourse of the novel. The savage, wild Dersimis, with the help of Mustafa Kemal's law will be domesticated and will put them as a part of production. The colonialist perception sees the guns asa threat to the resistance of Dersim. Also, the implication labour connotates more equal regimes too in order to purify the Republic. Therefore, the civilization as a positive word emphasized in the frame of school, hospital, military service and law which is introduced as the way of a better life in the novel. The position of Memo, as an insider, local heroadditionally increases the positive perception of the civilization discourse with his volunteerism to all these 'civilizer' institutions.

The participation of Memo and Senem at that feast is a functional instrument both to show the magnificence of the civilized people,to make the contradiction of 'wild-civil' clearer and also to convey to nations plans of the state about Dersim.[330] The observation of Senem as a savage Dersimiof the ladies at the table in a desirable nakedness, blinding wealth shows the attraction/charm of civil life of the women. The conveying message function of the feast, also, is seen as a dialog between the pasha and an officer.

---

[330]Bilbaşar points that his knowladge about the Dersim, coming from his researches/interviwes with citicizens and he defines the events that he used in his novels Cemo and Memo, as "Seyit Rıza and Seyh Sait rebellion". (Müberra Bağcı. 2002. "Kemal Bilbaşar'in Hayati Ve Eserleri Üzerinde Bir İnceleme". Unpublished Master's Thesisİzmir: Ege University,Pg. 75.)

The officer objects to the pasha in terms of the solution of Dersim issue. According to the officer, although the pasha assumes that the source of the robbery/brigandage is the sharecroppers actuallythe local leaders are responsible. The officer recommends that if they can intimidate the local leaders and prove the powers of the state everything will recover. The pasha, on the other hand, reminds the reports that the inspectors, the governors wrote before. According to the pasha, the reports recommend the following idea: Dersim is a boil and it should be cut with the lancet; the guns should be collected, and the leaders should be sent to exile. The pasha adds that another governor recommended that the Dersim issue stemmed from poverty, and the state should send them to Malatya and Elazığ. However, according to the pasha all these recommendations failed because the structure did not change since new leaders came into existence and continued the system. Also, according to the pasha,the Dersimis do not know how to live without their leaders. Therefore the aim, according to the pasha, is to change the system and the structure of Dersim with the land law that is supposed to finish sharecropper, which naturally will end the function of the local leaders. However, the officer objects to the pasha again and says that it is impossible to change the structure of Dersim without touching the sheiks, aghas, and he adds that Senem –a daughter of a sheikh— and Memo are not similar to the 'other' sheikhs and aghas. Also, because the local leaders force them to pay tribute and the state will want taxesDersimis will be oppressed by the leaders from one side and the gendarmes from the other side. In that case, the peasants will think that the state is not capable to protect them and will need to seek refuge again with the local leaders. According to the officer, the reason behind the provocation that the bards (traditional singers/poets) dare to make in the villages stems from the present distance between peasants and the state. The last emphasis of the officer is significant:

"I will not be surprised, if one day, another Sheikh Said derives here."[331]

The sentence is obviously an attribution to Seyit Rıza and Dersim 1937-38 process. Therefore, because of that 'danger' the commander comes and warns Memo to be aware of the 'Dersim reality'. Then, he begins to repeat the same ideas about the sheiks, seyits, aghas and places emphases on Gazi Pasha's effort to cope with these people. According to the commander, the land law frightened some lowland powers, and they started to provoke the 'ignorant', 'self-righteous', 'bloodthirsty' sheikhs, seyits, against the pasha of Elazığ. The commander adds that these people provoked them by saying the roads and bridges were made to destroy Dersim, and they strive to make the Dersimis vandalize the bridges and roads. After Memo 'enlightening' the local people the commander honoured him with the mission to be the leader of this fight and bring the people to 'the right way.' When Memo and Senem remain alone Memo, as the agent of transforming this 'consciousness', tells Senem that the people of Siirt, Van and Dersim are the sons of the same ancestors and there should not be any hostility towards the Ottomans among them. With the help of the 'civilized' ideas of the commanders/ pashas which was conveyed to Senem again by Memo, Senem becomes convinced and stops being anxious about the situation regarding Dersim. With the persuasion of Senem as the first person narrator of the novel the text legitimatess the state ideologyagain. In other words, with the so called 'revealing' of the 'real aim' of the Dersim leaders a pretext is found for the massacres. The seyit mentioned below, who assumed to rebel against the state and 'destroy' Dersim, therefore, is Seyit Rıza. With that, the novel creates a background and easily makes the reader establish the guilty, who is actually assigned as Seyit Rıza and the other leaders of Dersim 1937-1938.

Back to the plot, when Memo comes and tells the order of the pasha about sharing the land among the people, Huso objects to him. According to Huso, because of the 'monsters'[332] of

[331] İbid, pg.28. The original text is as following: "Günün birinde buralarda yeni bir Şıh Sait türese hiç şaşmazım..."

Dersim this cannot be possible.Finally, Memo convinces him about the decisiveness of the state. Some peasants also stress their concerns about the issues surrounding the position of the land. According to them, if they have lands the cruel aghas, sheikhs and seyits will persecute them and take the lands from them. Memo tells that after owning their lands they will not charge money to give the local leaders but just pay a tax to the state. In other words, every kind of initiative and power, according to the authorial eye, should be in the hands of the state not those ignorant, wild leaders.

The facing of Memo and Seyit Reşo shows the intent of the text. Seyit Reşo, who was a 'good' character in the first issue of *Memo*, begins to be depicted as a power hungry, non-equalitarian, rough man. He says that, the aim of the pasha is to provoke the people by this land law and create hostility among the Dersimis. On the other hand, the answer of Memo to this argument, represent the state discourse. According to Memo, the aim of the pasha is not to create hostility from the Dersimis because they are already an enemy to each other. That picture which Memo draws, places the Dersimis in a position in which they need a superior power to 'tame' them. The answer of Seyit Reşo, however, although the text aims to prove the opposite idea, shows that the modernity that state promise to bring is about money, not the prosperity of the Dersimis. In that context, the following words of Seyit Reşo are significant:

> "When Kemal pasha, took the throne from the caliph, dominated Anatolia, by making a law, announced that he would stop the centenary purpose of the Ottomans, with a mutual agreement, he promised to live together. Yet, as time goes on, he loved his place and he brought his promise, he spread on effort to change the structure of Dersim more than Ottomans."[333]

---

[332] This statement 'monster' will be also seen in Barbarsos Baykara's novels analyzed in this chapter *Dersim 1937*, *Tunceli 1938*which is used to define the leaders/resisters of Dersim.

[333]İbid, pg.57. The original text is as following:"Kemal paşa, tahtını Halifenin başına geçrip Anadolu'ya hakim olanda, zagon çıkarıp Osmanlının yüzyıllık kastına son vereceğini duyurmuş, karşılıklı anlaşıp bir arada yaşama bizimle söz kesmiştir. Lakin zaman ilerleyende yerine ısınıp o da andını tutmamış, Dersim nizamını değiştirmeğe padişahtan ileri gayret göstermiştir."

Although the structure of Dersim is depicted as a wild, cruel, and backward system, the explanation of Seyit Reşo shows the modernity movement of the state. The text, even though not consciously, shows the state's aims towards Dersim as a set of interventions. What Memo promised to the people on the contrary is 'to leave the local powers/believes/culture and obey the power of the state, believe what the state wants and adapt to the state's culture' which is not as wild as Dersim's structure. Although the text aims to hide that, it comes above surface with such dialogues.

The long answer of Memo to Seyit Reşo, however, is a pure propaganda of Mustafa Kemal. In the novel, although Memo a lot of the time emphasizes his loyalty to the Ottomans, when Seyit Reşo warns him about the identical attitudes of the Ottoman state and the Republic, Memo changes his idea. According to Memo, it is possible (not certainly) that the Caliphs persecuted the Dersimis because of Alevism, but the Republic never does that. The system of Dersim, according to Memo, which Seyit Reşo wants to protect is one of cruelty, wildness, poverty for the people and one that protects only the sheikhs, aghas or seyits. However, Mustafa Kemal is a fair leader who wants to form unity of the nation and he wants the people who are together to be subjected to the same law. By threatening and humiliating Memo, the function of Seyit Reşo's answer, on the other hand, is to prove the 'real face' of the seyits, sheikhs or aghas. In order to harden the cruelty of the local leaders the text focuses on the daily lives of Dersimis and tries to prove the cruelty.

For example, the money that the people give to sheiks in wedlock is shown as a persecution of the poor Dersimis. As the narrator Senem dramatizes the poverty of the people, and her cruelty reflected in the money she took from a very poor peasant Zaro.

Added to this, the text implies that the system of Dersim can even turn a good person to a cruel character because of the desire of power. Yet, the 'Republican' Memo, as a rescuer,

comes andreturns the money of poor Zaro.Healso permits all other people to marry even if they do not have enough money to give to the sheik and seyit to do so. [334]

In the meantime, the fight of Memo against both local leaders and the degenerate and unenlightened government officers proceeds. When he encounters Cemşido and Cemo, who was his wife in the *Cemo*, he comes back to the plot. Memo learns that, Sarikoğlu beats Cano and Cemo, who barely survives but loses her baby from Memo. Then Sarikoğlu puts them in jail. Memo, after this news goes and rescues them by talking to the qaymaqam. After giving the document of freedom for Cano and Cemo, the qaymaqam tries to escape but falls from a rock and dies. In other words, the text punishes the degenerate governor to prove the fairness of the Republic. The qaymaqam, who was close to Sarikoğlu in the novel*Cemo*, is killed (not by the hand of somebody but with poetic justice) in *Memo*'s second volume to prove that the authorial eye is a supporter of peasants. The hatred of Memo against the local leader becomes hardened.

As a matter of fact, Memo becomes angry with Senem due to her offer to go to a circumcision feast. He says that if she wants to go out, she can go to help the people instead of enjoying a wedding. After that argument, Memo refuses to wear his 'seyit's coat' and after a while, he begins to explain the reason for his anger. According to Memo, the bad experiences he had until that time stem from the aghas, sheikhs and etc. He begins to count all the sheikhs that harmed him before:the killer of his parentsSheikh Said, Sarikoğlu, Şıh Persin, another sheikh who is the killer of his uncle and the remaining who persecute the Dersimis consistently. According to Memo, the inequality between those leaders and the ordinary people—the 'sweating system' of Dersim—is the reality that makes him hate all these local leaders. Yet, by agitating the situation, the following words of Memo, which indicate the 'right way', become clearer. In other words, the reader is able to perceive the message easily.

[334] İbid, pg.74.

Therefore, Memo repeats his decisiveness to obey the new vali (governor of province) Abdullah Alpdoğan.[335]

However, one day the gendarme and some 'effendis' come and bring some documents which consists of the road tax debt for the tribe. With a very cruel attitude the effendis order them to pay the tax or send the workers to construction. Firstly, Huso answers them that they do not have such an agreement with the state, and he adds that they do not need roads. That answer aims to portray Huso an 'ignorant' but 'pure minded' peasant. However, it is necessary to point that this is another leak in the text that unconsciously interrogates the modernist eye of the novel. The 'ignorant' peasant asks a very legal question, but withMemo's intervention the readerfaces a deeper point of view. Thus, the interrogation of Huso remains underestimated/neglected and invalid,while Memo as the enlightened person takes his word.

Memo tells the effendis that the people of his tribe have already worked there during the Şıh Persin period and therefore, they should not be indebted. The corporal of the gendarme group whom Senem describes as 'sky eyed' and rancorous threatens peoplewith order of the effendis.

This corporal named Tursun Onbaşı is described in the text like local leaders who are until now the main reason for the Dersim issue according to the authorial eye. Tursun Onbaşı in a very rough, cruel way collects the men and brings them to the construction. Some people indicate the pasha[336]to be responsible for that event, but Memo objects and finds the local 'robbers' to be guilty. However, when they realize that men are taken from the other tribes too, Memo recommends going to Hozat in order to distinguish the right from the wrong.

---

[335] Abdullah Alpoğan, who has a very traumatic influence in the collective memory of the Dersimis, is shown here as the 'rescuer' and Bilbaşar, prefers to blame an 'onbaşaı' (corporal) instead of Alpdoğan who actually had the whole power in there.
[336] Abdullah Alpdoğan.

In order to not go to Hozat without money, which can help to solve their problem, they decide to request a loan from the leader of Demenan. When Huso takes money and returns to the village Seyit Reşo stops him and forces him to give the money as the 'seyit's right' and says that he will come and take his other rights from their tribe. In other words, until now, the Dersimis seem to be exploited by both the gendarmes, some effendis of the government and the local leaders. However, the Hozat's visit shows that the trouble is also coming from the contractors who make money from the workers. After Memo learns this situation, he becomes very sad and says that the government of Kemal Pasha is not a government of these degenerate effendis and of cruel sheikhs, aghas.

After that, they go to Elazığ to see the commander and the pasha. Tursun Onbaşı who comes before and behaves very roughly is there and does not bring them to the pasha. Fortunately, Senem recommends seeing the attorney Nusret Bey. When they go to the attorney he begins to tell them about the current situation. According to Nusret Bey, the aghas and beys are very worried about this land law. The pasha, in the absence of the commander that fights with the bad people, cannot overpower all these robbers. Nusret Bey claims those landowners and aghas, provoke the Dersim tribes to rebel against the state. He adds that, these landowners also send petitions to the pasha and the government about the Haydaran, Abbaslı, and Demen tribes and pretend to be victims of the robbery bythem. Also, he emphasizes that the reason behind both the collecting and sending people to work in structures and putting people under the persecution of the gendarmes is aimed to make Dersimis rebel against the state. With that rebellion they will both make the land law functionless and in order to take revenge on the Dersimis about not participating in the Sheikh Said rebellion, provide an excuse for the Ottomans to kill those Dersimis.[337] Nusret Bey also says that Seyit Reşo will fall in the hole

[337] Sheikh Said rebellion which is known as seperatist and reactionist in the official history, here, is given as the responsible of the Dersim rebellion. In other words, Dersimis who are potential 'progressivist', 'laic' citizens are provokated/deceived by the 'reactionist', 'bigot' Sheikh Said and his remaining supporters.

that the *haramiler* (robbers) have dug: the capture of Bagdad and the foundation of Kurdish government by Kurdish Pasha made the robbers' job easier. According to Nusret Bey, it will be very easy for them to misguide Seyit Reşo.It was already heard that Seyit Reşo met the men of the Kurdish pasha. Finally, Nusret Bey recommends them to stop Seyit Reşo and to tell him that the Dersim tribes will not merge under one flag and rebel. The only reason according to Nusret Bey is to spoil the game of these 'robbers' and to push Seyit Reşo from the scene. Senem describes Nusret Bey's long speech as an enlightenment.

Yet, the speech of Nusret Bey, besides speaking of the state being guilty blames every other dynamic. Firstly, it depicts the pasha of Elazığ as a naïve and unprotected person who is not able to cope with the problems without the commander. Also, the contractors and other ambiguous powers that are supposed to provoke the people of Dersimare not prevented by the state. In other words, the state is victimized and the Republic is introduced as a system that only wants to give land to poor peasants. The other application and behaviour of the state,which is possible to follow from the leaks and the traces such as forbidding the language, discrimination etc., are not counted as real situations. To build up the coming Dersim massacre upon the external provocations, the individual faults and the degenerated government officers the authorial eye seems to try to explain the reason behind the Dersim massacre by exonerating Mustafa Kemal Pasha and 'his republic'.

Back to the plot, Memo and Senem take on debts from a tradesmen Hacı Mustafa and pay some partof the tax. After finishing their works, they stay at Candarma Ali's home. Memo and some other bards play the saz and sing. One of the bards mentions about Şir, who represents Alişer.[338] Memo defines the meaning of 'lover of the truth,' and because of

[338] Yet, towards the end of the novel, Memo and Senem, turns in to Alişer and Zarife. The writer, but, emphasise that they were not rebel but the supporter of republic and their enemies of Memo; the sheikhs, aghas, misinformed the state and the state, becouse it does not the truth of the event, supposed them as guilty and rebels. Bilbaşar, uses the ALişer and Zarife's situation here by reproducing them as Kemalist, good people who became the victim of the Dersim local leaders.Soileau, Dilek. "Koçgiri ve Dersim Kürt hareketliliği: Koçgirili

rebelling against the state and the land law, Şir cannot be a 'true lover'.[339] After this speech, the lover bards hug each other and appreciate Memo for his enlightenment of them. From that time, Memo, becomes the propagandist of the state among the Dersimis and explains the wrongness of Seyit Reşo, Şir and their rebels.

When Memo,as the enlightened reformer leader, wants to go to the bazaar to sell a bell, the members of the tribes, the sharecroppers beg him to not do that because it has never been the case in Dersim that a seyit, agha went to bazaar. They try to convince him to not go. The following answer of Memo, who is also a 'local' person, shows the view of the west to the east[340]:

> "Look at them whose meats' are seen from their clothes, whose asses are seen from their torn pants! Instead of learning a lesson from the poverty of slavery, they supports my fame of seyit, agha more than me. Why are you so dependent to sharecropper, slavery so much? Did not the Pasha give you land, a place? Are not you the agha of your own place?"[341]

The western sight of the authorial eye shows itself by focusing of the Memo's mission. The people are so ignorant here that they cannot even distinguish right from wrong. However, the text by bringing cruelty, discrimination and a tyrant member of the gendarme Tursun Onbaşı into the forefront again changes the focus. As a matter of fact, immediately after Memo leaves the village the gendarmes come. Tursun Onbaşı persecutes people, humiliates themwith the help of other gendarmes. However, after all the cruelty of the gendarmes, Memo organizes a

---

Alişer Efendi ve Nuri Dersimi'nin rolüne dair" 335-356 in der. Şükrü Arslan. 2011. *Herkesin Bildiği Sır: Dersim*. İstanbul: İletişim.

[339] The rebel Şir cannot be 'tru lover', 'bard' but the Kemalist Memo is. Bilbaşar compares them and create Memo in as a mix of Kemalist hero and local respected bard to show the 'real face' of Şir and other rebels.

[340]That is, actually, Kemal Bilbaşar 'leftist/Kemalist' view towards Dersim; Memo is not a seyit but a proleterian and not Kurdsih/Zaza but Kemalist, and inevitably 'luminary' who should educate the 'ignorant' peasents.

[341]İbid, pg.171. The original text is as following: "Ule şu yırtık anterisinden eti, yamalı donundan götü görünenlere bak! Kulluğun sefilliğinden arlanıp yakılacaklarına, ağalık seyitlik şanıma benden ileri arka çıkarlar. Ula marabalığa kulluğa bunca bağlılık neye? Ule Paşa size toprak kom, tapılamamış mı? Siz de heymenizin ağası olmamış mınınız?"

'Cem'[342] to convince them that the attitudes of the gendarmes are not the state's policy. However, although Memo convinces them that time, after the winter, the gendarmes again begin to disturb them. The people that cut wood in the forest are beaten by the gendarme all over Dersim suggesting that the state forbids lumbering. Also they learn that cruel Tursun Onbaşı has a lot of supporters. This paradoxical situation is explained by Huso:

> "It is understood that, the goodwill of the Pasha, could not dominate the malevolence of the Ottomans"[343]

As a matter of fact, Tursun Onbaşı with the pretext of a permit withholds some women from the village. When Huso goes to talk with Tursun Onbaşı, he hits him, and Huso immediately dies. That becomes a breaking point for Memo, and along with other people he decides to attack the police station. The attack actually occurs in the spring of 1937.

With his participation in such events Memo becomes a rebel. When he says goodbye to Senem and sends her to a safer place, he says that the land law which could not be enforced all over the country, brought chaos. He wants Senem to educate their son as a lover, a bard who will teach people in the Republic: everything that the majority wants would work. When Senem reaches the village she finds Cemo andleaves her son to him to come back to Dersim. As the narratorSenem by saying that she will not be rescued from that 'flood' shows that she is aware of the coming danger, in fact the massacre.

The last chapter of the novel has another narrator. From the first book Cemo, to last volume of Memo, the narrators were 'local' people. Yet, under the title of "Hozat Seyyar Jandarma Alayı yedek Asteğmeni Dersim Ayaklanmasını Ait Anılarını Anlatıyo Sonsöz" (The substitute lieutenant of Hozat Mobile Gendarme Regiment is telling his memuars about

---

[342] The prayer of the Alevis, which here turns in to an insturement of the state propaganda.

[343] İbid, pg.197. The original text is as following: "Anlaşılır ki, Paşa'nın iyi niyeti, Osmanlı'nın kötü niyetinden baskın çıkmamıştır"

Dersim uprise), a sub lieutenant from Hozat Mobile Gendarme Regiment with his short narration makes the closure of the novel. The first sentence of the narrator is significant:

> "It is said that the Dersim rebellion was provoked by France because of the Hatay conflict. At the same time period, it is said that the British, whc made Kurdish Bekir Sıtkı Pasha and Kurdish officers, military coup to be done in Iraq, took a role in this rebellion. I do not know if it is right or wrong? But if you ask that if 'Hozat Mobile Gendarme Regiment has a sin?' Certainly I would say 'Yes it has!' Moreover, the regiment is extremely guilty of that. Because I was in this regiment for a few months before the rebellion, I know the sins and good things of the regiment very closely." [344]

This explanation implies that Dersim 1937-1938 was an 'inner' problem. The claim about such external affects is objectified by the narrator. Yet, the remaining of this chapter gives a wide background of the rebellion, whichthe narrator obviously wants to classify asnot a rebellion.

The narrator, after blaming the Hozat Mobile Regiment, mentions about the effects of *Takrir-i Sükûn*. Also, the *İstiklal Mahkemeleri* which was judged very quickly and executed people with the same rapid speed, according to narrator, bothered the conscience of the society. Therefore, the people who put the *Takrir-i Sükûn* law into operation are also guilty according to the narrator. Besides that, the narrator says that the supporters of Sheikh Said can also be considered responsible for the Dersim rebellion by indicating Dersimis as rebels.

The narrator after blaming some events and people for the rebellion passes to the neglected 'realities' of the Dersim rebellion. According to the narrator, the person responsible of the Dersim rebellion is known as Seyit Reşo;however, the people who attacked Pah gendarme station were from Demen tribe and wanted to rescue the women from their tribe, who were

---

[344] İbid, pg. 227. The original text is as following: "....Dersim ayaklanmasını, Hatay anlaşmazlığı yüzünden, Fransızların kışkırttığı söylenmiştir. Aynı aylar içinde Irak'ta, Kürt asıllı Bekir Sıtkı Paşa'ya, Kürt subaylarla bir hükümet darbesi yaptıran İngilizlerin de bu kışkırtmada rol oynadığı iddia edilmiştir. Doğru mudur yanlış mıdır bilemem. Ama 'Hozat Seyyar Jandarma Alayı'nın bu ayaklanmada vebali var mıdır?' diye sorarsanız, kuşkusuz, 'Vardır!' derim. Hem de vebali büyüktür. Ayaklanmadan pek az önce bu alayda çalıştığım için günahını sevabını yakından bilirim."

captured in the station. According to the narrator, the attack of Seyit Reşo to Sin gendarme station was not related to Demen's attack (which exactly resembles Memo's attack to station to save women), and it had happened at the end of March. However, according to the narrator, the rumours which begun last year, commented about the 'expected rebellion.' The 'bloodthirsty' Seyit Reşo after learningabout death of his well-loved son attacked both the gendarme station and the Kırgan village. According to the narrator, this news comes to Elazığ as a rebellion. The narrator adds that there was a Bulgarian officer that was provoking the pasha of Elazığ to eradicate Dersim. However, according to the narrator, the pasha defended economic solutions for the Dersim issue. When the pasha emphasized that he would bring civilization to Dersim without bloodshed that Bulgarian officer reminded of İbrahim Tali's solution and adds that without blood civilization cannot be constructed here.

The key point is that the narrator depicts the pasha as a peaceful person, who, however, suggests to make tribes of Dersim kill each other instead of initiating a military manoeuvre. According to the narrator, Seyit Reşo who seeks refuge with the Laç tribe is delivered by them. Also, the leader of Demen Cebrail and the leader of Haydaran Kamer are brought to Elazığ where they are all executed. According to the narrator, the pashasolves the problem by 'not shedding too much blood.' The pasha, after solving the problem, in the summer of 1937, again starts public works and '*temdin*'(civilizing) and forming 'bridges' between the Dersimis and the state. Yet, according to the narrator, the new prime minister's approach to the east was not *temdin* (civilizing)but *tenkil* (banishment). The narrator in that context shows the civilizing mission of the authorial eye. The civilizing which includes banishment and disciplining introduces here a 'right way' to solve the Dersim issue. In addition to that, the anger for the Sheikh Said rebellion keeps itself warm in the subtext. According to narrator, after Dersim becomes bloody, the supporter of Sheikh Said announces that Dersim took the effect of the Sheikh Said curse. In other words, the legitimization of the Dersim massacre in

the authorial eye turns into delivering the responsibility to some different sides which consist a very wide frame including the prime minister, to Sheikh Said, certain gendarme groups and some governors. Also, the authorial eye, implies that even the leaders of the Dersim tribes who are depicted as very cruel, are deceived, provoked and also pushed to the edge by some governors.

At the end of the novel, Memo turns into Alişer who along with with Zarife was killed by the niece of Seyit Rıza; Rehber. The killing of Alişer and Zarife, in other words, is represented in the novel as the killing of Memo and Senem. The aim of the text is to show that Memo who was playing the saz and telling the facility of the Republic to the Dersimis, is signed to be a 'provoker' by 'evil' people like the Bulgarian officer.Therefore, the Dersimis, according to the text,were Republican ad loyal to the state, but they were branded as rebels. The ignorant people of Dersimare hungry for civilization and need to be made 'conscious' by the republican luminaries. Also, by rejecting the resistance element of Dersim 1937-1938 and with the dramatization of the peasants the novel rejects the subjectivity of the Dersimis. The orientalist view of the novel, in other words, becomes also the legitimization of the text, although with the closure, the authorial eye tries to prove that the aim of this book is not to legitimize but to make an effort to understand the situation. Yet, the novel cannot survive the orientalist view, of which actually a western eye-looking is east, and by drawing the local leaders as 'evil' and by purifying the state it also cannot survive from the legitimization of the Dersim Massacre.

Dersim 37, Tunceli 38

The novels *Cemo* and two volumes of *Memo,* which are analysed previously involve the process that is supposed to create the Dersim Massacre. Yet, Barbaros Baykara's novel's

named *Dersim 1937*[345]and *Tunceli 1938*[346] as the titles connotates focus on the two crucial years of Dersim. In other words, the aim of these texts is to give a "literary" history of the Dersim 'rebellion'.

Dersim 37 has two fictional parts focusing at different characters. The first part of the inner Dersim, which is introduced through Kamber— the leader of the Haydaran tribe, including Bese, Seyit Rıza and other important actors of Dersim 1937, represents the 'dark side' of Dersim. The second part focuses on Binbaşı Kemal that represents the enlightened faces of the Republic and the 'light side' of the Dersim events. Also, the choice of character apparently is not a coincidence in terms of the idea of telling the 'truth' mentioned in the epilogue.[347]Especially, choosing Kamber as the main character that was one of the influential leaders of Dersim and was executed in 1937, provides the opportunity to claim of the telling the 'reality' on the Dersim side. This binary opposition between Dersim and the state, which depicts Dersim as 'evil', makes the readers empathize with the state and law enforcement agency. In another way, the 'boil' metaphor of the text of Dersim reports has its reflection in that text as well.

The novel begins in May 1936 with an ordinary day of Kamber.[348] The narrator introduces Kamber as a survivor of the Armenian 'relocation' whose real name is Levon. As an

---

[345] Baykara, Barbaros. 1974. *Dersim 1937*. İstanbul: Akyar

[346] Baykara, Barbaros. 1975. Tunceli 1938. İstanbul: Akyar.

[347]The truth of this novel is the offical discourse on Dersim 37 which is reveled in the epilogues of the novel which are analyzed in the third chapter. Ömer Türkeş indicates that theoffical history needs popular narration to empose the offical view. Baykara's two novel, in fact, do this funcition with its content/attitude. (Türkeş, A. Ömer. "Milli Edebiyat'tan Milliyetçi Romanlara" *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce Cilt4: Milliyetçilik (2009): 811-829.) pg 813.*

[348] The Dersim Armenians were perceived as threaten by the state. Baykara depicts Kamber Ağa as a remaining of eradicated Armenians who would also be eradiceted with the Dersim massacre. Baykara in his novel *Şırzi Nefret Köprüsü* describes how Armenian resisters (secret society) kill Turks and becouse of those massacres the state forced them to migrate. (Baykara, Barbaros.1974. *Şırzi Nefret Köprüsü.* İstanbul: Akyar)As the repating of the offical approach to Armenian massacre, Baykara accepts his novel as a referance about the history of 1915 events. Therefore, In this novel, Dersim 1937, the writer gives referances to Nefret Köprüsü in telling the Kamber Ağa's beckground. Kamber as a 'sruviver' of that 'migration' becomes Alevi, and throughout the novel he represent the 'power' of the state which would not 'forgive' the 'rebellion'. In other words, Baykara's this

Armenian Dersimi Kamber feels the fear of 1915, and the author reflects this fear to show the power and the superiority the state has upon Dersim and any other 'rebellions'.

That terrified character, Kamber, becomes the sphere for novel's ideology to show itself. Through the eyes of Kamber Dersim isdepicted as a place, which does not have schools, doctors, teachers and medication, but instead it has guns. There is nothing but illnesses, deaths, and malnutrition as the result of all of the ignorance.[349]

However, despite to this entire 'ignorance' and 'backwardness', Dersim with its untouchedand 'wild' nature is imagined as a female object that allures the 'male' west in order to dominate it. The relationship which consists of both desire and hatred is embodied by the relationship between Kamber, who is in fact the narrator, and the wife of Seyit Rıza,Besi. Kamber, by both desiring and scaring her, reveals the subtext of the novel. Also, the narrator himself with his comments/attitudes makes that desire significant. Therefore, the text constitutes the surroundings of Dersim with the image of the female Dersimis, especially with the focus on Besi.

With the depiction of Kmaber's maid Durdu the text gives a clue about the image of Dersimis in the narrator's eyes. Durdu, who hates the gendarmes because her 'brigand' husband and son are killed by them, is depicted as an 'extremely ugly women'. She represents ignorance andhostility towards Dersim because of her present 'slavery' to Kamber and 'unconscious' anger to the state.

---

chose, describing Kamber in a very powerfull fear and a wisdom about 'external interventions' seems to be a threatened to 'potential' rebels of the time period that the writer published his novel.

[349] That is actually a contrubition to the construction of the identity of 'modern' Turkish based on a 'savage' Kurdihsness, which is the orientalist view of the novel. Each of those things that the writer attributes to Dersim, consists a part of Turkishness which is obviously not a 'complated'/'stable' identity in 1970s similar to 'national literature' in 1920s-30s which aimed to built the Turrkishness in Anaotlia. (Türkeş, A. Ömer. "Milli Edebiyat'tan Milliyetçi Romanlara" *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce Cilt4: Milliyetçilik (2009): 811-829.) pg 821.*

On the contrary, Besi, who is the 'young' wife of Seyit Rıza, is described with an entire desire/eroticism. The depiction shows the narrator's impulse of reduction and subjugation of the image of Besi who isunable to subjugate the sphere of the novel (also as a historical event) due to her suicide. That impregnable 'female' in other words is objectified with eroticism combined with savageness. Besi is depicted as a very beautiful, splendid 'female creature and at the same time dangerous:

> "Besi was an absolute mountain beauty. The braveness of that seducing, witching mountain beauty, who dominated Seyit Rıza completely, was resounding all over Dersim. As much as her beauty and braveness, her fame from using the gun was making people shiver from fear. With his manners, Kamber knew that there was no shadow of compassion and mercy in that women.[350]

The desire drawn here is not only for the body of Besi, but also for her mind. As a matter of fact, the depiction of the narrator separates her from Kamber's, though it also shows that the desire does not belong to Kamber but the narrator himself.[351] The anger andthe desire of dominating of the authorial eye appeared in descriptions of Besi.[352] As a 'perspicacious' and 'unpainted beauty' she is also the murderer of eight men one of whom is an 'innocent' shepherd that admires and desires her longingly. Virtually, according to the narrator, Besi as a witch enthralles him, and thus, the shepherd is entirely her victim. At first, by making him fall

---

[350]Ibid, pg.14. The original text is as following: "Besi mutlak anlamı ile bir dağ dilberiydi. Seyid Rıza'yı avucunun içinde oynatan bu fettan, füsunlu dağ dilberinin cesareti bütün Dersim'de dillere destandı. Güzelliği ve cesareti kadar da, silah kullanmakta kazandığı ün herkesi korkudan titretirdi. Bu kadında, acıma ve merhamet duygularının zerresi bulunmadığını da Kamber görgüs ile bilirdi"

[351]Actually the narrator, on the other hand, functions as the voice of Barbaros Baykara, whose novel defines as 'documentary novel. Fethi Demir indicates that, Dersim 37 is a text which aims to share the views of the writer to the public, without any artistic concern, by adding the offical documents to the text. Yet, it is possible to add that to point of Demir, the aim is not only sharing but leading the reader in a certain though which also makes the novel a 'thesis novel'. (Demir, Fethi. " Karşıt Tezleri Savunan Politik Romanlar Bağlamında Dersim 1938 Olayları" in *Turkish Studies*-International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or TurkicVolume 9/12Fall2014, p.149-160,ANKARA-TURKEY)

[352] This metaphor, is a version of 'sexing the geography' which is evaluated a construction of geography by the 'west'. Kemal Bilbaşar attittudes here, therefore, is an example of that metaphor. (Schick, İrvin Cemil. 2000. Batı'nın Cinsel Kıyısı. Çev. Savaş Kılıç ve Gamze Sarı. İstanbul: Tarihi Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.)

in love with herself she dominated him mentally, while by shooting him she shattered him bodily. The metaphor used here, actually symbolizes the relationship between Dersim and the state, the east and the west in the authorial mind. The desire of having east/Dersim in order to domesticate it, turns into a fight which the west has not won yet due to its savageness.

On the other hand, by legitimizing the harassment of the shepherdthe narrator blames Besi and the traditions of Dersim. According to the narrator, the guilt of the shepherd is nothing but an innocent desire,yet for Dersimis his punishment is death. Dersim and Besi, therefore, are indicated as guilty for protecting themselves.

Besi, on the other hand, is introduced as a totalitarian, nationalist 'female' that tries to convince the innocent Dersimis that they are Kurdish and never tolerates any different ideas. The narrator in order to prove that idea writes about the killing of another innocent person Cafer Dede, because as he says, that they are Khazar Turks. However, the narrator, does not settle by bringing together blood and the 'wild beauty' of Besi: the same day, Besi kills one man from the Kırgan tribe to have her revenge. According to Kamber, the reason for Besi's terrorism is the opposition of the Kırgan tribes against the 'insidious' effort in order to establish a Kurdish state. Therefore, the thought of Kamber shows the desire and hatred towards Dersim through Besi's body:

> "But, even without actualizing, the fantasies about this women made his blood curdle and horrified him."[353]

As a matter of fact, the attitudes of the narrator towards Besi, has certain key words/adjectives which change between beautiful, glorious, charming to wild, bloodthirsty, cruel and tyrant. Besides Besi represents unvanquished Dersim, while Nahide by falling in love and then becoming the wife of Binbaşı Kemal symbolizes the masculinity of the power

[353]İbid, pg.19. The original text is as following: "ancak eyleme geçmese bile, bu kadına ait düşleri dahi tüylerini diken diken ediyor ve dehşet içinde bırakıyordu onu"

that subjugates Dersim. Kemal, who is "one of the revolutionist minds of the Young Republic", falls in love with Nahide who is the daughter of Hızır Ağa from the Haydaran tribe. The narrator highlights thatalthough he has had a lot of affairs with 'girls' and 'women', he has never had a crush on a girl in his entire life. The beauty of Dersim women, in other words, captures Kemal Binbaşı and he has a chance to talk with Nahide, unlike Besi that is untouchable. When he asks the village to give their guns, they offer ayran to him. The 'magical' beauty of Nahide, immediately affects Kemal. Nahide, at the same time confess her love to Kemal:

> "We, the mountain people are artless from top to toe. We do not lie and we are not hypocritical. If I said I love you, I am, understand me!" [354]

The novel, injects its own sight to characters to prove its thesis. Nahide says that although she knows that Kemal will bring trouble to Dersim, she loves him. The narrator describes the love of Nahide to Kemal as a 'fascinating' and 'flying to the sky'. As a matter of fact, after the permission of Hızır Ağa, the father of Nahide, Kemal and Nahide get married. After the killing of Hızır Ağa by Besi, the relationship between Kemal and Nahide goes deeper: like Kemal, Nahide also begins to desire to 'eradicate' Besi. As a matter of fact, Kemal says that he will execute all of them as if they solace Nahide. From now on, Nahide not only with her beauty but also mentally becomes 'Kemal's young wife' just like Seyit Rıza's 'young wife' Besi. Kemal realizes his fantasy to have the 'wild' beauty of Dersim upon Nahide, and he dreams to have the 'savage' Dersim as well.

The march of 1937, Kemal and Nahide are happily married. Nahide as a wife cares for the needs of her husband, cooks and serves him with a great loyalty and love.[355] That time also

---

[354] İbid, pg.92. The original text is as following: "biz dağ insanları başından tırnağa kadar açık sözlüyüz binbaşı. Bizde yalan riya yoktur. Sevdik dedikse sevmişizdir, anla bunu!"

[355] This depiction actually has a 'diciplining' implication, Nahide as the other Dersimi can be o potential 'citizen/wife' if the taming becomes sucseed. This metepher, the love of a Kurdsih/Dersimi women to Turkish officer, occures in the novels written with different ideology and different time period. *Zeyno'non Oğlu* (1928)

marks the beginning of Dersim 1937. After having Nahide, Kemal, in other words, is highly motivated to domesticate the 'remaining' part of Dersim.

The female characters obviously are imagined as the symbols of Dersim. The undisciplined part of Dersim is representedby Besi, while the part of Dersim readyfor taming/domesticating is represented by Nahide. The Dersim and the image of Dersimis as together, on the other hand, are described as a mixture of wildness/savageness, ignorance and poverty:

> "The women remind the coon because they are thin and tall, and the children were ugly as chimpanzee. They were swarthy in all skin and bones appearance."[356]

The ugliness of Dersim, in the novel, depends on their disobedienceto 'civilization', and in fact, Dersimis are not perceived as even human beings. Therefore, the narration does not hesitate to humiliate them both physically and mentally. As a matter of fact, according to Kemal, they are so ignorant that they 'even' do not know Turkish and how to eat a meal properly:

> "Some of them were trying to eat with wooden spoons, some of them grasping the pilav with meat. He was watching that without loathing, without finding them odd."[357]

As the observer, Kemal, describes their wildness and the detestation by claiming just the opposite. In other words, despite to the oddness of the Dersimis which naturally causes loathing, as a Republican officer, Kemal tolerates them which shows his/the republic's hierarchical superiority .Therefore, the explicit emphasis on the 'wildness' reveals the

---

and *Kalp Ağrısı* (1924) written by Halide Edip, *Dağları Bekleyen Kız* (1934)written byMahmut Esat Karakurt and Ali Arslan's novel *Serçe 2* (2004) have the same theme with different perspectives. For example, *in Serçe 2*, a Dersimi exiled women Serçe falls in love with the officer son of the family that she is adopted when she grows up. Yet, when the officer learns that she is a doughter of a 'rebel' tribe, he beats and leaves her. The officer is a negative character here, but in the other novels, the officers are positive characters who disciplined the Kurdish women with love.

[356]İbid, pg.77. The original text is as following: " Kadınları ince ve uzun bir marsığı andırıyorlardı. Çocuklar ise bir şempanze gibi eciş bücüştüler. Deri-kemik halinde yanık kalmışlardı."

[357] İbid, pg. 80. The original text is as following: "Kimi tahta kaşıklarla yemeye gayret ediyor, kimi etli pilavları avuçluyorlardı. Yadırgamadan, tiksinmeden izliyordu bunları."

attitudes of the narrator. As a matter of fact again the narrator describes them as the 'odd people of east' in the point of view of 'western' soldiers. The following speech of Binbaşı Kemal, reveals, the sight and the intent of the text very clearly:

> "Tell him Reşo, this motherland is ours, as we will not go, tomorrow others will come here. They will construct roads and bridges. Even they will help them to build home. They (Dersimis) will not live in the caves like animals, shelter in lairs. They will not be the slaves of the agha working with peanuts. By having responsibilities and jobs, they will send their children to school and they will speak pure Turkish in daily life."[358]

Here, Kemal sermonizes to the Dersimis about what the Republic brings to them.[359] They will be civilized by the state, they will speak the state's language and finally, they will be 'developed.' The language that Dersimis speak is called by the narrator and Binbaşı Kemal *çevre lisanı* (the environment language) and the people described as 'wild animals' who need to be tamed by the Binbaşı Kemal/the state.

The Dersimis, on the other hand, tell about the persecution of local powers from whom they suffer to Kemal, but their speech which seems to bethe legitimization argument of the state. According to that, the people are in hands of 'bloodthirsty,' 'separatist,' 'ignorant' and 'greedy' local powers and the Republic's role is to rescue them from this oppression and cruelty. However, the people who are imagined as 'intended citizens' are called as mountain people/animals and along with this the colonial desire of the narrator is manifested by using the character of Kemal Binbaşı.

---

[358]ibid, pg 81. The original text is as following: "Söyle ona Reşo, bu vatan bizimdir, biz gitmeyeceğimiz gibi yarın da buraya başkaları gelecek. Yollarını köprülerini yapacaklar. Hatta ev yapmaları için yardım edecekler. Artık vahşi hayvanlar gibi mağaralarda, inlerde barınmayacaklar. Boğaz tokluğuna ağaya kul köle olmayacaklar. İş güç sahibi olup çocuklarını okutacaklar ve günlük hayatlarında da Öztürk'çe konuşacaklar"

[359] Begining with the description of Dersimis with a humilitaion, Barbaros Baykara, contribute the 'connonic' function of novel in the Republican History. Türkeş, depicts that function as the need to 'talk/adress/appeal to somebody or to inform and elucidating. Like Bilbaşar, who perceived himself as a leftist 'luminary' Baykara without the leftist view, contruct the same discourse. Yet, as it is mentioned in this chapter, Baykara, for example draws a hierarchy on his novel over Bilbaşar, who is implied as 'less nationalist/statist –which means less truthfulness according to Baykara- then Baykara. The historical function of Republican Novels, therefore, is obviously exist here.

As a matter of fact, Kemal humiliates Cebrail in front of his tribe, defends himself with a claim that 'fighting with feudalism' requires him to do that. Also, the narrator legitimizes the humiliating/ maltreating/beating of local powers by picturing them as tyrants. The following thoughts of Kemal show the progressive point of view of the novel and the aim of the novel to legitimize the Dersim massacre:

> "The state was planting its symbol to the place where it has been groaning for centuries, under the persecution of sheikhs and aghas. And the people who were left to poverty, were receiving their own soldiers as the occupying soldiers of the enemy. He reacted against to this unfairness. He was burning with ambition to tell his people the truth."[360]

The narrator/Kemal perceives to hold the state power and to legitimize the 'occupation' pretends to be on 'their'side. The text, in other words, both reveals the reality that the narrator tries to hide, which is actually the case 'occupation of the state', and the intent of narrator which actually to legitimize the massacre. Therefore, it is possible to point that, the narrator uses hischaracters, especially Kemal and also Kamber, to prove his claim and to show the 'necessity' of eradication of Dersim. The *Sel Hareketi*, according to Kemal, is inevitable and dyingand living is not the matter of*Sel Hareketi*.

On the other hand, Seyit Rıza, Alişer and Cebrail are on the other side and the narrator, throughout the text endeavors to show the justification for their eradication. Those characters are 'treacherous' 'imperialistic''rebelious,' and 'cruel' enemies that do not kneel in front of the Republic and should be eradicated as soon as possible. As a matter of fact the narrator says that there is a 'monster' in Dersim:

> "Some important developments were occurring in Dersim... The monster will soon exit from its lair. When they started to annihilate the economic

[360] Ibid, pg.71-72.The original text is as following: "Asırlarca şeyhlerin, şıhların sultasında inim inim inleyen bir yerre devlet ilk defa oalrak simgesini dikiyordu. Ve yoksul bırakılmış bir halk kendi askerini istilacı düşman askeri gibi karşılıyordu. İsyan etti bu haksızlığa. Halkına gerçekleri anlatabilme hırsıyla yanıyordu"

problems, collect guns and find jobs for the people, the monster would exit from its lair." [361]

The monster, according to the passage, is the resistance elements that do not accept the modernization movements of the state. Although it is very obvious that the modernization movement consists both of a military attack and cultural assimilation, the narrator defends those acts of the state and blames the ignorance of the 'mountain people' of Dersim along with the 'imperialistcompradors' of Dersim's local powers.

As a matter of fact, the novel embodies the 'British' affect with İzzettin's character that helps Seyit Rıza and Alişer in the rebellion.[362] That character, however, is captured and killed by Binbaşı Kemal, and thus, the power of the state overcomes the 'British' provocation and France's support because of the Hatay issue. Therefore, the novel, though one character finds the 'secret' behind the rebellion, and by killing the character annihilates the 'exteriors' creating the poetic justice for the novel.

The novel later describes the attacks of Sin at the gendarme station and the Harçik Bridge by the rebels. The 'monsters' of Dersim with such actions have exited from their caves. Therefore, the responsible of rebellion is indicated here to bethe cruelty of local powers that do not accept to be equal with the Dersimis. Therefore, Seyit Rıza is described as an ordinary cruel feudal agha. On the other hand, Alişer and his exteriors connections are indicated as the theorist to bethe rebellion. As a matter of fact, after the attacks of the Turkish Air Force, even Seyit Rıza accepts to surrender; however, Besi objects to that with the support of Alişer. Throughout the novel, for the first time Kamer declares 'his ideas' out loud: these leaders, Seyit Rıza, Kamber, Kamer, Cebrail, himself and the other leaders that rebelled were deceived

---

[361] İbid, pg.36. The original text is as following:Önemli gelişmeler oluyordu Dersim'de.. Canavar yakında ininden çıkacaktı. İktisadi dertleri ortadan kaldırmaya, silah toplamaya ve halka iş bulmaya başladıkları gün canavar ininden çıkacaktı."

[362] In the novel of Munzur Çem, *Gülümse Ey Dersim*, İzzettin occures as İzzet, as a close friend of Nuri Dersimi.

by the external powers, and in order to stop the war their surrender was a necessity. The novel exposes its'intent' throughthis 'confession.'

Alişer is depicted in the novel as a very clever, Kurdish separatist and Seyit Rıza's right hand man. Binbaşı Kemal gets Alişer killed to prevent such brilliant man's further actions in Dersim. After Alişer's murder by Rehber the leaders including Seyit Rıza are arrested. According to the narrator, Seyit Rıza upon his arrest blames his dead wife Besi and Alişer in the court in order to survive from the execution. By that, the text aims to show Seyit Rıza as an 'honourless' feudal person to the readers. As a matter of fact, the execution process of Seyit Rıza is not told in the novel in order to not dramatize his death. Instead of that the novel finishes with the execution of Kamber who has represented the authorial voice from the beginning of the novel.

The second novel of Barbaros Baykara, *Tunceli 38*[363] is actually the second volume of the *Dersim 37.*This second volume directly referrers to the *Tunceli Kanunu* (Tunceli law), and with the suppression of 1937 Dersim finally becomes Tunceli in 1938. In other words, this volume is about Dersim which is 'embraced' by the state by the1937 movement, with which it reached its new name and new rules. However, in the prologue the author with his authority of authorship and 'well –versed' in the history of the science claims that the Dersimis are 'mountain Turks' who were turned into Zaza/Alevi because of the cruelty of Yavuz Sultan Selim. According to the author, Zazaki is a language seventy percent of which consists of Turkish words. As a linguist, historian and an author, after determining the ethnical/linguistic/history of Dersimis, Baykara asks the reader to appreciate the state because of the 'civilization' that it brought in 1937-1938.

The novel is set from December of 1937 to October 1938. Because of his successes in *Sel Heraketi* in Dersim 1937 Kemal Binbaşı rises in rank and becomes *Yarbay* (lieutenant

[363] Baykara, 1975.

colonel). However, the mission of Kemal is not completed yet. The state wants to solve the problem of Dersim in all aspects and wants to rescue the 'hardworking', 'clever', 'honest' Dersimis from the caves via exile.

The first character that is significant in the novel is Dursun Onbaşı, who was Tursun Onbaşı in the *Memo*—tyrant gendarme that was responsible for the massacre. However, in this novel, Dursun Onbaşı is depicted as a patriotic young person who bombed himself in order to not give the munitions to the Dersimis. The novel, in other words, by reconstructing the character of Tursun Onbaşı as Dursun Onbaşı purifies itself and the gendarme who was accused for the massacres in the novel *Memo.* Another crucial part of the novel is the details which are given about the gendarmes. BesidesDursun Onbaşıthe novel gives both the past and present feelings of the other members of Hozat Mobile Gendarme Regiment in order to create an empathy towards them, on the contrary to *Memo*. For example, in this novel some gendarmes become mad and kill themselves because of the heaviness of the Dersim 1937-1938 events.[364]

The author, on the other hand, accepts some 'extreme' situations which the soldiers kill people 'unnecessarily'. Yet, these soldiers are implied to be 'reactionary' individuals that have prejudices against the Alevis. In other words, according to the novel, the modern, laic, nationalist soldiers like Dursun Onbaşı or Sıtkı Üsteğmen did the right thing, but some reactionist, ignorant Sunni soldiers, who were also threatened by the Kemalist ideology, might have killed innocent people.

Besides that, nieces of Seyit Rıza Zeynel and Rehber who are described as 'sheepish,' 'diffident' and 'cowardly' decelerate their loyalty to Yarbay Kemal. Kemal accepts their loyalty because of their previous help. Here, another allusion is indicated to Kemal Bilbaşar in the novel. Memo and Senem in *Memo* are killed by Rehber. Yarbay Kemal says that he

[364] Baykara, it is obvious that, was aware of the massacre in Dersim 1937-38. Yet, he aimed to prove the 'necessity' of that becouse of 'wildness' of Dersimis who were fighting all together. Therefore, here, Baykara depicts the gendarme as the victim of the Dersim 1937-38.

accepts their loyalty because Rehber killed 'the ringer (the bell maker) and his wife,' who took money and seeds from the state to help Seyit Rıza with that money and call people to the rebellion. The 'ringer' and his wife are obviously, Memo and Senem who are the main Characters of the Kemal Bilbaşar's novel *Memo 1-2.*This novel, in fact, aims to show that Memo and Senem were not innocent because they manipulated the state, and they were supporters of Seyit Rıza along with being 'bandits,' on the contrary to Bilbaşar's novel Memo which introduces them as 'innocent,' 'Kemalist' and 'victims'. Therefore, the novels of Baykara *Dersim 1937*and *Tunceli 1938* obviously make an effort to 'correct' the 'wrong' information in Bilbaşar's novels, including the purificatio of the state's role in the Dersim massacre.

With tthese interventions to the previous texts/novels about Dersim the author constructed the novel over the preparations of the 1938 movement on both sides. The local leaders' priors such as Hasso Gavo, Kopo Hüseyin, Cubikeşoğlu Ahmet resist against the state that obliged them to an exile. Also, the author builds another female focus character as a shadow of Besi in this issue.

In the first novel, Besi was the representation of Kurdish separatists. Yet, Besi turns into Fadik, the fiancé of Haso Gevo, with her beauty and militancy. On the contrary to Besi, Fadik is depicted as an Alevi and a pioneer of the rebellion. Like Besi, she is also depicted as wild, unmerciful and cruel. As a matter of fact, with her commitment to Alevism Fadik is perceived as dangerous as the Kurdish separatists.[365] However, according to the novel, the only danger that the state fights is feudalism and persecution of the Dersimis by the local powers highlighting the poverty and ignorance of the Dersim:

[365] The nationalist ideology, in the Repuclican novels occures as a 'Turkish-Sunni' frame, therefore, on the contrary to immagination of Alevis as 'original' turks as a Kemalist view point, it is obviously, here Alevism is also 'other' of Turkish nationalism in this example. (Türkeş, A. Ömer. "Milli Edebiyat'tan Milliyetçi Romanlara" *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce Cilt4: Milliyetçilik (2009): 811-829.* pg 814)

> "The children of this region who are fed by cereal their entire life, look at people's face as if seep"[366]

Here, again, the Dersimis are not accepted as 'human beings' but as wild animals. The socio-economic situation, which according to the novel makes them like that, means that the education by thestate is the only solution to that. As a matter of fact, the novel, as a leitmotif, repeats the importance of 'education' by referring to the feature. The Dersimis, who according to novel forgot their Turkishness, their language, worshipped the local spiritual leaders and became wild, poor, ignorant Zaza/Kurdish, should be educated as soon as possible. With the following quotation of Kemal, the novel tells its concerns both about education and the future, which actually can be seen as the 'writing intent/reason' of the novel with long passage as following:

> "Maybe we will retire and go aside. The people who depart from here, will come back to the new Tunceli. The grandfathers, fathers, because of psychological reasons, will tell events to their children, with exaggerations in reversed version and the fresh brains will be contaminated. And maybe, the baby that you become will witness its birth in a kennel cave, will also take education but, its mother will tell that you that he killed its father. The young men of the future will nurse a grievance for you. And it will come to a point that, the irresponsible and self-seeker politicians will exploit these feelings to the utmost in order to reach prosperity on these people. By distorting our actions it will be whispered to the people's ears and a betrayer campaign will be run in order to put us to shame. And maybe, the brigands, smugglers, the remains of the feudal system will be called as citizens, thereby some of us who are tired from coffeehouses will be taken to courts, and be forced to concede." [367]

---

[366] İbid, pg.146. The original text is as following: "Ömrü boyunca tahıl yiyen bu yörenin çocukları da insanın yüzüne davar gibi bakarlar"

[367] İbid, pg.127-128. The original text is as following: " belki emekli olup birer köşeye çekileceğiz. Buradan gidenler tekrar yeni Tunceli'ne dönecekler. Dedeler, babalar, okumaya başlamış olan çocuklarına olayları psikolojik nedenler ile abartarak ters yönde anlatacaklar ve körpe dimağlar kirlendirilecekler. Ve belki de, senin izbe bir mağarada doğumuna tanık olduğun yavru da okuyacak fakat annesi babasını senin öldürdüğünü söyleyecek. Yarının delikanlısı sana kinlenecek. Ve bir noktaya gelinecek ki sorumsuz ve çıkarcı politikacılar bu insanların sırtından ikbale yükselmek için bu duyguları alabildiğine sömürecektir. Eylemlerimiz sapıtılarak

The passage frames two basic concerns of the novel. First concern is the education that the Dersimi children will receive after Dersim 1937-1938 and the possible charges that the people who conduct the operation will face in the future. The first one is in fact directly blaming the Dersimis for providing miseducation to their children about the Dersim events. It is possible to deduce that the narrator/Kemal/novel does not trust Dersimis and the children should not be educated by them, because if they have the opportunity to educate their children they will tell the 'reverse version' of Dersim 1937-1938. Also, by putting the parents in such a positon, the novel objects to the narrations of witnesses of Dersim 1937-1938.

Besides that, the passage criticizes future politicians and policies of the state. The politician that accepts the invalid thoughts of Dersimis is blamed to be 'self-seeker' or 'exploiter'. Finally, the passage reproaches/ becomes angry about the future state policies which will call the 'remainders of feudalism' citizen. According to Kemal, they do not deserve to be citizens, and the killing of them is legitimate.

In other words, the Dersimis, who tells the 'reverse story' of Dersim 1937-38, are the ruins of the brigands, robbers, and the feudal people of Dersim. With that passage, the novel indicates that the 'civilization' and 'progress' that the state promised to bring also led to a lot of casualties. Therefore, it is stated very clearly that if it was a massacre it was a necessity, and no one can judge them about that. By such words, the novel, aims to reach not only the present readers but the future readers as well.[368]

---

kulaklara fısıldanacak ve bizleri rezil etmek için hain bir kampanya açılacaktır. Ve belki de, yok ettiğimiz eşkıyalar, kaçakçılar, feodal düzenin kalıntıları için vatandaş denecek, bazılarımız, emekli kahvesinden alınarak, mahkemeye çıkarılmaya dolaysıyla ödün verilmeye gayret dilecektir. "

[368] The confrontation which has been debating in recent years, for example, is one of the direct concern of the Baykara as it is obvious. The narration of witnesses, the documentaries, etc about Dersim 1937-1938 were perceived as a threatened and because of that, the novels that called Dersim 1937-38 as massacre were published by the people who were generally from Dersim and supporter of Kurdish movement in 1990s and as non-canonical/illegal novels. This situation, it is possible to say, proceeded until 2010s with some exepctions. Also Çayan Demirel's documentary named Dersim 1938 was banned by the state and in 2010 the ban was removed. http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/dersim_belgeseli_38_artik_ozgur-1008967 (access date: 10. 04.2015)

Kopo

In this part, Mustafa Yeşilova's novel *Kopo*[369] is the other canonical novel which have reproduced the orientalist view and functions as a legitimization for the massacres with a Kemalist/leftist point of view like Bilbaşar's novels. The novel is based on Kopo/Qopo that is a well-known resister in the Dersim 1937-1938 process. In other words, the novel constructs a character that is a powerful brave sharpshooter and is also loyal to the notion of the Republic similar to Bilbaşar's character Memo. As another story of a 'noble savage' *Kopo*, with the orientalist view, the legitimization of the Dersim massacre has been produced here too. Also, the effect of the 'interior' enemies on the Dersim 1937-38, who are in fact the local leaders/Kurdish separatists, is underlined in this novel as well.

The implications of the Baykara's novels about the exteriors and the governors' faults are taken from the apparent exterior enemies and given to the inner enemies that continue the Ottoman reactionist attitudes in the Yeşilova's novel.

In that context, although the social structure of Dersim was not acceptable in terms of the state and therefore, was removed, the responsible of the massacre is not indicated as the Republic of Mustafa Kemal. Yet, the interior enemies who are the 'rotten' remains of the Ottoman state (which is signed as Nuri Dersimi and the Armenians in the following novel that is analysed futher in this chapter, *Mustafa Kemal'in Kuşları Dersim Yanıyor*) are responsible for the Dersim massacre.[370] Another basic emphasis is the position of Mustafa Kemal, who is

---

[369] Yeşilova, Mustafa. 1978. *Kopo.* İstanbul: Milliyet.

[370] Ömer Türkeş, indicates that the novels of early republican period which were written coherent to Turkish History theisis, were not concerning about the past, but they were telling the 'today'. Yeşilova's novel, Kopo, in the novel targets the 'reactionsts', degenerated people of his current time by reffering Dersim 1937-38. In other words, the Dersim is the a proper area to reconstruct the Kemalist'leftist idea, as Türkeş indicates, for the time the novel published, the and of 1970s. Therefore, the 'luminary teacher' type, 'reactionst Ottomanists', 'feudal Kurds' etc are the basic types of the novel. (Türkeş, A. Ömer. "Milli Edebiyat'tan Milliyetçi Romanlara" *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce Cilt4: Milliyetçilik (2009): 811-829.pg* 816)

depicted as a father figure. According to the novel, he was ill, and the enemies tried to destroy the Republic behind his back.

On the other hand, the main figures/symbols of the Dersim rebellion have also been reproduced in the novel. The first images of Dersim, as the previous novels are also framed, is the ignorance of the Dersimis and the 'ruthless' social structure of Dersim. The Dersimis according to novel need the 'light of science' that the Republic will bring.[371] Also, they need to leave their 'feudal' culture, which is bloody and primitive even if they are very 'proper' to the republic. In the novel, these thoughts are repeated from the beginning to the end but the emphasis is different from Baykara's novel which completely blames the local powers including Seyit Rıza, Bese etc.

As a matter of fact, as the 'leader' of the rebellion Seyit Rıza is introduced as a wise, good figure, who suffers from the approach of the state towards Dersim since the Ottoman state. The opposite character of him is depicted as a wise, Republican, laic seyit who is called as *Molla*. Kopo, on the other hand, is depicted as a character that is influenced by both but entirely agrees with Molla who supports the state in removing the social structure of Dersim and adapting it to the 'civilized' Republic. In that context, these characterizations are functional in terms of manifesting the Dersimis as 'Republican' or 'better' candidates than the 'reactionist' Ottomanists for Republic citizenship. Therefore, the picture of Dersim that is plotted in the novel has two sides: desperation/ignorance/poverty and wildness/brigandage/ bloodiness caused by it. At that point, the novel is blaming the remaining traditions, poverty and the spiritual manipulators and finally, the exterior/interior enemies instead of Seyit Rıza or the other 'loyal' leaders. Therefore, according to the novel, the loyal Alevis have been deceived by some 'bad powers' which are poverty and then the enemies of the Republic:

[371] Türkeş indicates that, the modernity which was a fetish, the imagination of kurds was an important instrumenet to describe their modern identity. As a Kemalist and leftist writer, Yeşilova, obviously, realizes that in this novel. (Türkeş, ibid pg. 821)

> "The Republic and Atatürk were the aspiration of the Alevi. Dersim hated the Ottoman field that the zealot fattened. He/she did not taste anything except pain. Laicism was a life condition for him/her. A day was arising from the Alevi, Bektashi culture. They had resisted the Iranian, Arabic culture. The bards who carried three cord saz on their shoulders, had been the wardership and defender of Turkish culture."[372]

The Dersimis, as it is pointed in the passage, distinguish themselves from the 'other' eastern people who are indicated as separators or reactionary such as Sheikh Said. Later in the passage, it is claimed that such enemies of the Republic deceived the Dersimis and assigned them as rebels. The ignorant people and the exploitation by the spiritual leaders, which according to novel are exactly the problems that the Republic wants to solve, caused the current situation. The Republic did not remissness, but the Ottoman state and its remainder which was the 'Ottoman aghas' and 'the zealots' were responsible of the movement towards Dersim according to the novel. Seyit Rıza, however, is not depicted as one of these remaining troublemakers of the Ottoman state. Instead, he is presented as a laic, republican figure who suffers from the poverty of Dersim and the cruelty of the gendarmes that persecuted them. The depiction of the local leaders in the way ofSeyit Rıza's depiction makes them as 'objects' that were deceived and further loyal citizens of the Republic.[373]

In fact, with that the text declared the superiority/mercifulness/ civilization of the Republic that rescued them from this 'bad fate'. The targets of the novel is the peoples/powers as Sheikh Saidthat were 'separatists' and 'reactionist' aiming to destroy the Republic. In other

---

[372] İbid, pg.76. The original text is as following:Cumhuriyet ve Atatürk, Alevinin özlemiydi. Yobazın semirdiği Osmanlı tarlasından Derismli nefret ediyordu. Orada acıdan başka bir şey tatmamıştı. Laiklik onun için bir yaşam koşuluydu. Alevi Bektaşi kültüründen bir gün doğuşuyordu.İran Arap kültürüne karşı durmuşlardı. Omuzlarında üç telli sazlarıyla ozanları Türk kültürünün bekçiliğini ve savunucunluğunu yapmışlardı"

[373] It is also coherent the Kemalist Discourse on Alevism which ntroduce Alevis as the ideal citizens of the Republic because their 'laic' belief system which is actually a part of legitimization of the Dersim 1937-38. Yeşilova, follows the same path in this novel. (Bozarslan, Hamit. 2003. "Alevism and the Myths of Research: the need for a new Research Agenda" Pg 3-15 in White, Paul Joseph, and Joost Jongerden, eds. *Turkey's Alevi Enigma: A Comprehensive Overview*. Vol. 88. Brill, Pg 3)

words, the Dersimis are depicted as Turkish /Alevi that were the best 'candidates' for citizenship of Republic, but the 'other' evil aghas/ideologies/ exterior enemies manipulated and massacred them.

Kopo as a folk hero, represents that 'potential' powerful, cleaver, loyal Kemalist individual whose aggressiveness stems from the individual unfairness that the local governors/gendarmes enacted towards him. Because of these faults Kopo becomes a rebel. At that point, Kopo'scharacter is exactly matched with Bilbaşar's character Memo. Both of them are republicans; both of them are clever, good bards and sharpshooters. Yet, both of them due to the the weakness of the governments are forced to fight against the state.

Kopo, in that context, is introduced as a very good fighter that becomes famous among the Turkish Army. As a matter of fact, Abdullah Alpdoğan orders the soldiers to find him, but they fail. Then, Abdullah Alpdoğan orders the soldiers to find people whom Kopo respects. Hıfzı Saler, whom Kopo respected, after meeting Abdullah Alpdoğan goes and convinces him to surrender.

Then, after a while, Kopowith a hurry goes to the garrison. He does not listen to the warnings, and the soldiers and Kopo shoot at each other. Kopo, without any injuries, reaches the room of the officer and says that he is ready to surrender. The first impression of Kopo in the eyes of the soldiers represented the resemblance of Kopo to a savage/wild animal.[374] Yet, according to the narrator, as a 'noble savage' Kopo has charisma among them. The admiration of the authorial eye, in other words, to Kopo's enigmatic power comes together in this scene withits desire to 'civilize' him. As a matter of fact, the pasha, Abdullah Alpdoğan, says that although his past is not clean, he is loved and thus, he will be sent to the west to be free of the local leaders and to educate his children.

[374] İbid, pg. 125.

Kopo, with his mother and lover Elif are sent to exile to Kayseri. Kopo becomes Hüseyin Dağyeli in the west, tries to catch the 'civilization' that the Republic has promised. Yet, the reactionist, ignorant people who are depicted as the 'Ottoman aghas' prevent Kopo to be a part of the civilization. The exile will fail not because of the state policies, but the enemies of the republic: reactionist, feudal etc. who are introduced as the Ottomans which is the 'past' of the Kemalist regime which it does not want to remember.

As a matter of fact the chief of the village that Kopo settled, who is described as opposed to laicism and does not have the 'light of the republic,' on the contrary to the village teacher who kills Kopo's mother. After all this misbehaviours experienced in exile, the loss of his mother becomes the last straw and Kopo kills the chief. Kopo becomes a fugitive and comes back to Dersim. The novel at that point criticizes the governors such as the pashas/governmental officers that are not 'enlightened' enough for the republican regime. Therefore, those bad types, are drawn as the responsible of the faults that the regime has done. As a matter of fact, the 'bad governors' type is the responsible for the fate of Kopo that is judged without questioning. In addition to that, the 'reactionist' and the 'Ottomanist' part of the Republicincluding Abdullah Alpdoğan, in other words, is also responsible for all this exile process.[375]

At the end of the novel Kopo is killed by the gendarmes some of whom believe in the innocence of Kopo. The closure of the novelagain makes the defense of the Republic by indicating the death of Kopo to be a fault of the 'Ottoman remains' within the Republic. The new Republic, which embodies the character of Mustafa Kemal, never makes such mistakes but the other enemies in order to destroy the Republic do that. As a matter of fact, according to the novel, Mustafa Kemal was ill, and he along with the governors in Ankara did not know

[375] On the contrary to Bilbaşar and Baykara, Yeşilova blames Abdullah Alpdoğan which is actually significant because of the other similarities between three novels. Although this significant difference, blaming individual or 'interior'-'exterior' enemies theme, is obviously proceeded in this novel, either.

the situation. When Fevzi Çakmak comes to Dersim and sees the casualties he orders to stop that, but according to the novel, Abdullah Alpdoğan does what he wants after Fevzi Çakmak leaves.[376]

The orientalist discourse and the nationalist attitudes of the previous novels are repeated in Kopo. Although on the contrary to Bilbaşar, he directly blames Abdullah Alpdoğan and signs the responsibility on the 'reactionist,' the Ottomanists, the 'uncivilized' feudal leaders, part of the Republic that should be removed by the 'real' republicans. The mutuality among *Kopo* and the previous novels, on the other hand, sees Dersimis as purely Turkish. Lastly, as the representation of the power of Mustafa Kemal/the Republic, Turkish Air Force is depicted as 'the birds of Mustafa Kemal,' which becomes the name of the next novel that is analysed here, *Mustafa Kemal'in Kuşları Dersim Yanıyor.*

Mustafa Kemal'in Kuşları Dersim Yanıyor

After a long period, the last novel was written to legitimize the massacre with an orientalist view. In 2012 Bilal Civelek's novel *Mustafa Kemal'in Kuşları Dersim Yanıyor*[377] is written,and it empowers the 'exterior power' claims on Dersim 1937-1938.[378]

The prologue of the novel, decelerates its objectivity and emphasizes the source of the novel as witnesses of the Dersim 1937-1938. Also, it claims that the information in this novel goes beyond the ordinary discourse and should be handed down to the next generations. Yet, the author refuses to give references about the source of information because according to him, this is a novel not an academic study. Before the novel begins the author warns the readers to

[376] İbid, pg.102.
[377] Civelek, 2012.
[378] This novel is one of the 'fruitful' product of 2010s's Dersim novels. The novel was intorudyced by *Milli Gazete*(National Newspaper) as the novel which gives 'frame-broker' information about Dersim and according to the news, the novel Show the importance of 'multi cultural' life. Yet, the novel, it is possible to say, does the exact opposite of that as it is evaluated in this chapter. It is possible to point that, the novel was written as an 'answer' to the novels written on Dersim wihich were out of the offical discourses on Dersim. (http://www.milligazete.com.tr/haber/Mustafa_Kemal_Dersimde_vurulmus/265839#.VTTO0ZN8vKg Accsess date: 15.04.2015)

read the novel with 'nonideological' eyes after indicating the guilty of Dersim 1937-1938 to be exterior and inner enemies.

The 'evil' characters of the previous novels that were Dersim's local powers in this novel turn into Armenian Dersimis such as Bozo, Goppo, Alişer and Baytar Nuri (Nuri Dersimi) who are indicated as a member of a 'deep state' and/or 'British agent'. Also, one of the main characters Munzur as a 'yuruk' is depicted as the clever, powerful, brave person that is at the same time loyal to the state. Besides Munzur, who is depicted as a Sunni and a Turkish nationalist,another main character Haydar is introduced as an orphan whose family was killed in the Koçgiri rebellion even though they were not rebellious. On the other hand, the novel as another important character depicts Seyit Rıza, who is deceived by Nuri Dersimi.

Firstly, the novel, by implying on the 'tyranny' of the Armenian people who live in Dersim as Dersimis, tries to distinguish the 'real' Dersimis and the 'Armenians' from each other. According to novel, the unmerciful, tyrant characters are actually Armeniansthat want to take revenge. As a matter of fact, Bozo, as a member of the team who collects the needs from the village, is actually a looter and a killer. Goppo and Alişan are also 'relatives' of Bozo, and are also introduced as 'evil' Armenian. In addition to that, the most significant connection in the novel is the relationship between those 'evil' characters and Baytar Nuri.

According to the novel, those 'cruel' Armenian people were cooperating with Baytar Nuri who is actually a British agent. Also, the son of Seyit Rıza, Bava İbrahim was killed by two Dersimi Armenian professionalkillers implementing the 'secret' order of Baytar Nuri.[379] As a matter of fact, the narrator introduces him as responsible figure of Koçgiri, who was 'in the scene' again in order to 'provoke' the Dersimis.

[379] İbid, pg. 205-213.

The founder of the Kurdistan Teali Cemiyeti (The Growth Association of Kurdistan), Baytar Nuri, according to novel, had already cooperated with the British, and continues his 'plans' on Dersim. Also, according to the novel, Baytar Nuri was deceived by Seyit Rıza due to his provocations. The killing of Bava, therefore, is planned to convince Seyit Rıza to rebel against the state.

Seyit Rıza, on the other hand, is introduced in a contradictory position. The influence of Baytar Nuri, according to the novel, pushes Seyit Rıza to the rebellion. He is not a rebel and in fact, he wants to make peace with the state, but 'deep' powers with Baytar Nuri do not let him to finish it. Also, in the novel the main characters that are aware of the 'evil' side of Baytar Nuri throughout the novel implies that he will escape if the rebellion is not successful. In other word, according to novel, every single person who is loyal to the state are aware of the 'agency' of Baytar Nuri, but Seyit Rıza is not.

The dialogues between Munzur and Baytar Nuri are also significant in terms of the conflicts in the text. Munzur tells Baytar Nuri and Seyit Rıza that he is a Turkish Yuruk. Baytar Nuri reminds him that he speaks Kurdish and shows that he is a Kurd. This dialogue besides indicating the Kurdish propaganda of Baytar Nuri also shows the intent of the novel. According to the novel, as the previous novels emphasize clearly these people are actually Turkish, but some 'exterior' powers manipulate them. Also, they are ignorant enough not to distinguish these interventions. Therefore, the state has to come and 'eradicate' these problems which consist of both rescuing the Dersimis from the local leaders and 'educating' people to prevent the 'exteriors plans'. Therefore, the subjectivity of Seyit Rıza, in that context, is refused and introduced as a 'tool' in the novel.

The novel brings closure to 'rumours' about the death of Mustafa Kemal by being shot in Dersim by a female rebel in 1938. However, the novel gives proofs to refute this argument by the characters in the novel that claim to be witnesses. The aim of the novel, in other words, is

to prove the wrongness of the claims about Dersim 1937-1938 by objectifying Seyit Rıza, making Nuri Dersimis as agent and blaming the Armenian originated Dersimis to be responsible for the violence.

The novel indicates the bloodiness of the Dersim 37-38 but justifies it by emphasizing the exterior effects and the social structure of Dersim. The 'birds of Mustafa Kemal' which indicate the 'Turkish Air Force', in the novel is used as a leitmotif to show superiority, the power of Mustafa Kemal/the Republic and the state. The novel also appreciates the state in civilizing the 'Tunceli people' and creating soldiers, architects, teachers, politicians such as Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu,[380] from the 'ignorant, disadvantaged' Dersim in the epilogue. Therefore, this novel, which directly blames the local leaders of Dersim and the 'exterior effects' after a long time period, brings the same view and the discourse of the previous novels into consideration again.

4.2 .The 'Derivative Discourse': The Language Of 'Oppressed'

Beside the novels that legitimize Dersim 1937-1938, there are also novels that reverse the thesis of the previous novels, exactly in the same literary way[381]. Haydar Işık's novel *Dersimli Memik Ağa*[382] and *Arevik*[383], Munzur Çem's three volumes of *Gülümse Ey*

---

[380] Current chairman of Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (Republican People Party).

[381] Fethi Demir seperates the Dersim 1937-38 novels as two groups, political/propagandist and non propagandist. The novels in this chapter can be counted as the 'political/protagandist' novels. In addition to that, Demir, the first group also seperate in to two groups: The first group is consist of the novels *Cemo, Memo, Dersim 1937, Tunceli 1938, Mustaf Kemal'in Kuşları* etc. which evaluate the Dersim 1937-38 as the poin of view of the Kemalist ideology. The second group on the other hand, evaluates the Dersim 37-38 as the total persecuation of the state, according to Demir. Also, Demir adds that the writer of the second group's novels are from Dersim and they tried to create novel from the thing that they heard about the Dersim 1937-38 from their environment. Because of that attitdus in novels which aims to tell the 'tragedy' of Dersim, according to Demir, those novels do not have a high literal value like the novels which defend the offical state thesis. (Demir, Fethi. "Sema Kaygusuz'dan Dersim Trajedisine Dair Modern Bir Roman: Yüzünde Bir Yer." *Uluslararası sosyal Araştrmalar Dergisi* cilt:7 sayı 29, (2014): 239-249.

[382] Işık, Haydar. 1990. *Dersimli Memik Ağa*. İstanbul: Belge uluslararası Yayıncılık.

[383] Işık, Haydar. 2013.*Arevik Dersim Tertelesinde Bir Ermeni Kızı*. Ankara: Satırarası.

Dersim[384], and Cafer Demir's novel*Umudu ve Tutkusuyla Qopo*[385] are significant examples of that reverse approach.[386] Besides the recreation of the ideas of the 'statist' novelthe following texts in some way with the discourse on nationalism /unity/ backwardness/ ignorance reproduce the previous novels' legitimization and orientalism over Dersim. As Partha Chatterjee has recommended the 'derivative discourse' of these novels that decelerates Dersim 1937-1938 as a massacre cannot survive the language of the 'oppressors.'[387]The characters of the previous novels change in regards to the sight of the oppressed. The real figures coming from history such as Seyit Rıza, Alişer, and Besi, Kopo or Nuri Dersimi and the fictional characters created for the novel exactly construct the opposite ideas of the 'statist' novels. In other words, the voices of the 'suppressed' leave their shadows on the novel/the language of the subalterns, and the subalterns derive their discourse upon the suppressed power's language. That is, these texts aim to establish a very similar structure only with a different name of 'Kurdishness.'

Yet, it does not mean that these novels include an eradication/neglect notion towards the 'opposite' nation similar to the example of an 'oppressor' observed in Baykara's novels. However, they use the same enlightened/patriotic characters to give a consciousness to the 'ignorant' people that are not able to see the persecution of the state. Although they seem to be very different from each other, in terms of the ideological aspects, objectifying the people as it isdone in the previous novel can be seen in the novels of this part.

---

[384] The first volume is as following: Çem, Munzur. 1990. *Gülümse Ey Dersim*. İstanbul: Deng. In this study the following issue will be used: Munzur Çem. 2013. *Gülümse Ey Dersim*. 3 cilt birarada. İstanbul: Deng

[385] Demir, Cafer. 2005. *Umudu ve Tutkusuyla Qopo*. İstanbul: Umut.

[386] It is not possible to think the rise of those novels with the rise of Kurdish movement in 1990s. Abbas Vali as the editor of *Turkish issue of Essey on the Origins of Kurdish Nationalism*, in the introduction of the Turkish edition describes Kurds in a struggle with the dominant ideology which stole the history of Kurds from them. That novels, can be seen as an attampt to take back the 'history' by rewring the novels of the offical history. Vali, Abbas. 2005. Kürt Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri. Çev. Fahriye Adasoy, Ümit Aydoğmuş, Sema Kılınç. İstanbul: Avesta. Pg 8-9.

[387]Chatterjee, Partha. 1986. *Nationalist thought and the colonial world: A derivative discourse*. London: Zed Books.

In other words, with an opposite 'ideology' this novel in the literary aspect exactly fits the previous novels, which is defined as a thesis novel.[388] Therefore, these similarities also serve the foundation of a 'derivative discourse' of the 'oppressor's language and at least, with the nationalist view repeats/reproduces the previous novels/oppressors ideology.

*Dersimli Memik Ağa (*The Dersimi Memik Agha*), Arevik* and *Gülümse Ey Dersim* (Smile Dersim) can be analysed as crucial examples of the derivative discourse of subalterns. Same applies to*Umudu ve Turkusuyla Qopo* (Qopo with his hopes and passion) as a rewrite of the character of Kopo as of Mustafa Yeşilova's novel with the name after the historical figure Qopo Hüseyin in the Dersim 1937-1938.

<u>*Dersimli Memik Ağa*</u>

The first novel analyzed here is*Dersimli Memik Ağa*[389] written by Haydar Işık[390].It is one of the first novels which describe Dersim 1937-1938 as a massacre.[391] The novel aims to show that Dersim 1937-1938 was an experienceexactly opposite of the narration of the previous novels. The state is the real occupant, 'savage' and the brigand that persecutes Dersimis and aims to establish 'the system of exploitation' in Dersim and in fact in 'Kurdistan'. The state aims to colonize the Dersim/Kurdistan, and the defense/resistance of Dersim is defined as a 'patriotic' act towards the 'occupying state'. Yet, although the novel describes the state as a colonizer and exploiter of Kurdistan, with the nationalist discourse in some aspect it uses the

---

[388] Hamit Bozarslan indicates that the historiography of Kurdish nationalism is also constructive which is a product of effects from different actors by giving answer to offical historywriting, Alevi or Armenian historiography. Here, in a fictional area, it is obviously construction of Kurdish nationalism by creating an answer to those actors. Hamit Bozarslan, "Kurdish Nationalism in Turkey: From Tacit Contrat to Rebellion (1919-1925)," in Essays on the Origins of Kurdish Nationalism ed. Abbas Vali (Costa Mesa, California: Mazda 2003).

[389] Işık, Haydar. 1990. *Dersimli Memik Ağa*. İstanbul: Belge.

[390] Haydar Işık is Kurdish/Alevi activist who has been in exile since 1970's. He was a writer in *Yeni Özgür Politika* which is a supporter of Kurdsih movement. Therefore, the traces of those will be followed in his both novels.

[391] The publishing date gives a clue about the novel. The Kurdsih Worker Party (PKK) beginign with 15 Agust 1984, was in war wtih Turkish Republic. In 1990, according to Bozarslan, the organization had gained an 'environment' consist of Kurdihs politicians and old nationalist elites. Therefore, it is obvious that, the aim of the writer is to contribute to the nationalist mission of PKK via this novel. (Bozarslan, Hamit. 2004. *Türkiye'nin Modern Tarihi.* Çev. Heval Bucak. İstanbul: Avesta. Pg.110-111.

same arguments used by the 'orientalist' and 'legimization' novels such as 'ignorant people', comprador feudal leaders'.[392]

The novel has an omniscient narrator who is also intrusive which makes the intent of the text visible. As a matter of fact, according to the novel, the Dersimis are ignorant and the 'feudal' aghas, who persecute/exploit people, are responsible of the massacre with cooperation with the state. Indeed, the protagonist of the novel is an agha named Memik as a 'cruel' character who resembles the 'agha's' characters of the novels analyzed before, except for enabling them as 'comprador' due to their attitudes towards the state. Also, the manipulation of religion can also be followed in the novel as seen in the previous novel with an only difference of the manipulator being the state not Dersim's spiritual leaders. Dersim is depicted as motherland of the Kurds and the Dersimis as Kurdish on the contrary to the previous novel which emphasizes the Turkishness of Dersimis. Therefore, the discursive construction of these novels has some common points with the previous part's novels, and may make one think that *DersimliMemik Ağa* is a reverse version of those novels.

On the other hand, the novel has two main characters that actually represent a 'villian' and 'hero' in the eye of the narrator. Memik Ağa, as a matter of fact, as an agha that cooperates with the state is the total source of the evilness, and Hemedi as a patriotic resister represents the ideal character of Kurdishness in the narrator's eye.

The novel begins by introducing Memik Ağa as one of the senior persons of the Arean Tribe. The depiction ofMemik Ağa as the protagonist of the novel in many aspects shows the narrator/authorial eye's intent. Memik Ağa is described as a 'self-seeker', cruel agha that

[392] Bozarslan indicates that, after the failure of Barzani rebellion in 1974, the Kurdsih nationalist mind experienced very serious trauma and it caused a turning point. Barzani was the last castle of the past approach and from now on the 'feodal' Powers could not able to be the part of Kurdish nationalist thought. Thereore, according to Bozarslan, the new approach was Marxism. The feudal lords which are described in the novel as compradors can also be seen as the traces of that approach. Bozarslan, Hamit. "Türkiye'de (1919-1980) Yazılı Kürt Tarih Söylemi Üzerine Bazı Hususlar." İn Kürt Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri. Pg 35-63.

persecutes his tribe. Also with the gap betweens the wealthy and the poor the agha is depicted as responsible for the life conditions of the people. The Marxist view here is a crucial part of the figure, but it is not the main concern of the text.[393] The main emphasis of the novel is onthe social status of the agha that makes him a 'comprador' who betrayed his people/Dersimis. The attitude of the narrator in describing himshows the function of the character as an agha:

> "The children of the agha stay like an icon beside him. His words are seen as a divine order to them. Nobody holds his children who fall into place or are crying. It is a kind of insult to take their children on their lap and love them. To smoke or sit down for a meal is impossible. There was a master-slave relationship between him and his sons instead of father-son."[394]

Memik Ağa as the passage shows is a tyrannical character that behaves very cruelly even to his children. The authority that he has is capable to make them do everything. In other words, the narrator with this depiction implies the role of such kind of aghas in the Dersim massacre and hierarchical structure of society that harms the poor people. The figure of the agha here is described as a pure evil power which should be cleaned from society in every aspect. As a matter of fact, Memik Ağa does not hesitate to make his son kill his daughter's lover İvrahim. Also, he forces his daughter Fate to marry a man whom she does not love. He recommends to his daughter's husband Çavdar to kill her whenever he wants or to torture her every day. This action/approach of the agha forms a *type* and becomes a symbol of the entire wickedness. This attitude of the narratorprevents the reader to have any empathy with that evil character.

Yet, all the evilness that is attributed to the character is aimed to show the 'comprador' role of the aghas in the 'resistance' of Dersim. As a matter of fact, Memik Ağa, has good

---

[393] The 'new approach' of Kurdish nationalist which Bozarslan indicated, Marxism occures here. İbid, 60-61.

[394] Işık, 1990. Pg. 22. The original text is as following: "Ağanın yanında çocuklar put gibi dururlar. Onun dediği ilahi bir emir gibi gmrülür. Kimse onun yanında yere düşen ağlayan çocuğunu bile kaldırmaz. Onun yanında çocuğunu kuacağına alıp sevmek bir çeşit hakaret olur. Sigara içmek o izin vermeden sofraya oturmak olanaksızdır. Ağa ile çocukları arasında baba-oğul ilşkilerinden çok uşak efendi ilişkileri vardı."

relationships with the commanders, state officers, according to the writer, in order to look more powerful among the people. Although the agha knows the 'malevolence' of the state towards Dersim, in order to comfort/survival of his family and himself, he continuous to cooperate with them. As a matter of fact, when his son Mursa, who is also depicted similarly to father Memik Ağa, kills İvrahim to restore the family's honor, his father comforts him with following:

> "There is nothing important in this event for the Turks. Not one, if you want, kill by the dozen. What they do, is not something different from that."[395]

Memik Ağa is shown here despite all his awareness about the state, he is as brutal and as capable to make deals even under those circumstances. The authorial eye, by that way, makes the agha responsible of the massacre along with the state. Also, due to theinevitable 'nature' of the agha, who cooperates with the state, he accepts 'assimilation'. Yet again the text shows its factual side with this explanation in order to remind the Kurdsihness of Dersim:

> "Our tribe is on the side with the state. Either a big agha, or me, do not want our state to be harmed. You know our troubles. In truth, we have had many troubles. It is not easy to make the people believe. Until now, no one knows. Everybody knows that they are Kurdish. Well, we strive for it, we say to them that they are Turkish. There is no Kurd. All of us are Turkish. Thanks to God, we are even from Horosan. In truth we do not know where Horosan is. Yet, the General Avdula Paşa said that, we are as such. Well, now, is it necessary to tread on the general's toes? So, we say that we are so." [396]

---

[395] İbid, 22. The original text is as following: "Türkler için olayın hiçbir önemi yoktur. Bir değil istersen düzineyle öldür. Onların yaptığı da bundan başka bir şey değildir"

[396] İbid, pg.24. The original text is as following: "Bizim aşiret devletten yanadır. Gerek büyük ağa gerekse bendeniz devletimize zeval gelsin istemezik. Bilirsiniz bizim zahmetleri. Hem vallahi, hem billahi ki çok zahmet çekeriz. Kolay değil halkı inandırmak. Bugüne kadar kimse bilmez. Herkes Kürt olduğunu bilirdi. Eh biz uğraşiriz, Türk deriz. Kürt yoğtur. Tekmilimiz Türktür. Allaha şükür hemide Horosanlıyız. Vallahi kumandan Horasan neredir bilmezik. Lakin Genereal Avdula Paşa hazretleri böyleyiz demiş. Biz yani şimdi generalimizi mi kıralım? Biz de öyleyik diyoruz."

This words of Memik Ağa show his treatment of the state. According to this passage, it is obvious that the state, which is represented here by General Avdula Paşa (Abdullah Alpdoğan), orders the aghas to tell people that they are Turkish. The agenda of the state is to assimilate people. Memik Ağa voluntarily accepts Turkishness but also implies this 'Turkishness' to be a fictional situation by highlighting the unfamiliarity of Horosan and perceiving 'Turkishness' as anorder of the state. In other words, the novel tries to show that the Dersimi aghas that say that they are Turkish know that they are not, and wit this emphasizes the aim to make the Kurdishness of Dersim more certain/clear. This attitude, inevitably connotates the effort of the previous novels to prove the Turkishness of Dersim but here, even the 'bad' characters know the reality which according to the narrator is'undeniable'.

Another significant function of the character Memik Ağa is proving that Dersim 1937-1938 was a massacre that aimed to eradicate/annihilate the entire Kurds. Memik Ağa, from the beginning of the novel to the end does not abandon supporting the state. Yet, his motivation changes step by step: at first it is declaration of power, thenbeig safe and at the end surviving from the carnage. His approach towards the state's acts, is highlighted as the following:

> "The agha was not perceiving himself even as Kurd. 'Being Turkish is a profit. Being Turkish is safe.' He was thinking. 'The people are talking because of they are jealous'. He was saying." [397]

The novel depicts the belief of Memik Agha inthe state very sharply which makes the dramatic ending of Memik Ağa more effective. Also, this passage implies his 'ignorance' of the agha about the state that is far worse than the agha. As a matter of fact, while Memik Ağa is supporting the state and spying for it, the governmental officers, the commanders are

[397] İbid, 29: The original text is as following: "Ağa kendisini artık Kürt bile görmüyordu. 'Türk olmak çıkardır. Kürt olmak güvenliktir'. Diye düşünüyordu. .'Millet kıskançlığından söylüyor' diyordu. "

planning to kill him after obtaining all information/support from him. The narrator by focusing on the Turkish soldiers' mind indicates those plans as the following:

> "Memik Ağa was airing his son lungs. The captain was pretending not to have heard the Kurdish talks. He was considering them as 'Unclean Kurds'."[398]

The omniscient narrator,by revealing the 'thoughts' of the captain aims to give evidences of the expected end. The captain, as a matter of fact, also adds that they are decisive to eradicate all the brigandage in Dersim. With this the novelemphasizes the image of Dersim/Kurds in the eyes of the state. The Kurds are 'unclean', 'brigandage', and 'uncivilized' in the eye of the state, and sice there is no difference between the statist and the rebels the aim is to carry out a genocide. As a matter of fact, Memik Ağa in order to escape from the massacre augments the denunciations. After the killing of another state supporter agha Cıvraklı Bertal (Bertal from Cıvrak) Memik Ağa becomes more worried about his future:

> "Will it (the state) kill the people who are on its side? Bertal, who is on the side of the state? Moreover, his tribe had stabbed Sheikh Said from his back. How can this Bertal be killed? And what's more, cut his whole family. It is inexplicable." [399]

Cıvraklı Bertal, on the other hand is being signed here as a betrayer who has been cooperated with the state from the very beginning. Yet, the state, according to novel, aims to eradicate the Kurds, use the 'compradors' and then kill them as the other Kurds. As a matter of fact, although Memik ağa, consoles himself with his past including 'sending a telegram' to Lausanne saying that they want to live with the Turks and go along with the state during the 'rebellion.' Yet, after the killing of another agha Ali, Memik Ağa begins to be more anxious that he will be next to be killed by the state. As a matter of fact, the state, after compressing

---

[398] İbid, 45. The original text is as following: "Memik Ağa oğluna küfürler yağdırıyordu. Yüzbaşı Kürtçe konuşmaları duymamazlıktan gelir gibi bir tavır içindeydi. İçinden 'Pis Kürtler' diye geçiriyordu"

[399] İbid, 63. The original text is as following: "Kendisinden yana olanları da mı öldürecekler? Bertak ki devletten taraf. Askeriyeye yardım eder. Üstelik aşireti Şeyh Said'i arkadan vurmuştu. Bu Bertal nasıl öldürülür? Hem de bütün sülalesini kes. Anlaşılır şey değil."

the resistance of Demenan, Haydaran and the other resister tribes, kills him and his whole family.

Memik Ağa, in other words, dies 'dishonorably' by being a comprador, but the other Dersimis tat resist die 'honorably' such as the figures like Hemedi, who resist the state and become heroes of the Kurds/Kurdistan with an 'honorable battle'. The 'ignorant/deceived' Kurds/Dersimis, the Kurds who are 'without national consciousness' are in a 'miserable' position. The ignorance that the previous novels attributed to the Dersimis is about the lack of 'civilization,' which means that by being Turkish they will be able to become civilized. In this novel, in other respects, being 'ignorant' or miserable is about not having the 'Kurdish national consciousness.' The Dersimis, who resist against the state and do not deny his/her Kurdishness, are depicted as wise, honorable and heroic people because, the perceptions of 'civilization' of the state and the Dersimis/Kurds are totally different. The followin narrator's explanation about Dersim 1937-1938 is crucial to understand that the main differences between the thesis of the previous parts of the novels and this novel:

> "The civilization has come to Dersim with its most barbarian methods. It was bolt, gun, and bomb. It was a lock over the Kurdish mouths. The civilization was the denial of the existence of the Kurdish people. The civilization was the prohibition, the exile. The civilization was death, death!"[400]

The narrator becomes intrusive here and criticizes the 'civilizational' discourse of the 'state'. [401] It tries to convince the reader about the 'real face' of the 'promised civilization' of the state.

---

[400] İbid, 82. The original text is as following: "Uygarlık en barbar metotlarla Dersime girmişti. O toptu, tüfekti, bombaydı. Kürtlerin diline kilit vurmaydı. Uygarlık, Kürt halkının varlığını inkârdı. Uygarlık, yasaktı, sürgündü. Uygarlık ölümdü, ölüm!"

[401] Işık criticises the modernity perception of the state but not modernism itself. The 'modern' is acceptable if it come with the Kurdistan, for example. Melda Yeğenoğlu indicates that, the the orientalasing the east should be searched in modern attampst of the local elites who try to 'develop' and 'civilize' the their own people. The development here is the awarness of the 'national conciousness', the manipulating potential of the religion by the state, the danger of feudal lords who are compradors. Therefore, it is obvious that, the wirter recomends a

In that context, the novel also indicates the manipulation of religion by the state in order to convince the Dersimis of that coming civilization. With the help of the 'comprador' aghas, the state tells the people Mustafa Kemal is Alevi and it is right to support him, and as Sunni Kurdish rebels it is necessary for them to fight against Sheikh Said. According to the novel, with this religious manipulationthe state disrupted the unity of the Kurds and prepared to kill them. The arguments of the 'legitimizion novel' as it is seen occurred here in a direct opposite version.

As a matter of fact, Hemedi, the 'hero' of the novel, defines Dersim 1937-1938 as an occupation not a civilizational movement, and he is described as the follower of Pir (Seyit Rıza) and Eli Şer (Alişer). Therefore, Hemedi as representative of the Dersimi resistance/Kurdishness is also the informer/elucidator figure of the novel. Both the Dersim perception of the state and the method of battle against it are told to Dersimis by Hemedi:

> "It is saying that Dersim is the lair. Dersim is the head of a boil. It should be annihilated." [402]

Hemedi, after defining the situation, recommends an honorable death, instead of being 'a slave of the state. As a matter of fact, according to Hemedi, the aim of the state is to make the Kurds their slaves,exploit the Kurd's motherland and assimilate them. Also, according to Hemedi, the Kurdish people who were forced to work in the railway/bridge/barracks construction are similar to the Ancient Roman slaves. The Roman slavemasters had already vanished but the things of what the army did there, was worst than the things the Roman slavemasters had done. [403]

---

modernization for the ignorant 'Kurdish people' who do not have national conciousness. (Yeğeneoğlu, Melda.2003. Sömrügeci Fanteziler: *Oryantalist Söylemde Kültürel ve Cinsel Fark.* İstanbul: Metis. Pg. 157-158.)

[402] İbid, 76. The original text is as following:"dersim eşkıya yatağıdır diyor. Dersim Çıbanbaşıdır. Yok edilmelidir."

[403] İbid, 51. "Romalı köleciler"

With this resembles is the authorial eye decelerates that Dersim as a Kurdish region was a part of Kurdistan and the state is trying to colonize it. The only survival method, according to Hemedi and the narrator, is resistance. The Turkish Republic, which according to the narrator, is more 'cruel' then the Ottoman State, wants to eradicate and assimilate the remaining people by exile.Exile, which is introduced as a 'heaven', according to Hemed, is "worst than death" because both the carrying period and the exile itself are full of humiliation and torture. Also, he adds that it is actually lucky to die in the "wagons" because exile brings the following:

> "In fact, it is worst to survive and reach somewhere in the west. At that time, you do not know the people's language and culture. You do not know their ways. You are a rioted brigandage. You are unclean Kurd. You are Qızılbash. Because of that reason you suffer from affront. They dishonor you. It is better to die instead of living dishonorable."[404]

With this passage, it is aimed to inform the reader about the exile which is seen in the novel *Kopo*.As it is analyzed before, even the protagonist Kopo, who is described as a 'republican', experiences those situations explained in this quotation and turns back to Dersim. The exile, which is described by Hemedi as harmful in terms of both physically and socio-culturally, is also seen as a threat for the future of their Kurdishness. As a matter of fact, Hemedi recommends the Dersimis to rescue the children primarily because they are the 'future' that will pay the state back for this massacre and educate them about the 'unity and solidarity'. That recommendation also connotates Baykara's novel *Tunceli 38* which is analyzed in the first part of this chapter. In *Tunceli 38,* the protagonist Kemal warns the other soldiers about the 'miseducation' of the Dersimi children which willclassify Dersim 1937-1938 as a massacre. In this novel, as it is obvious in the passage, Hemedi, exactly recommends to educate the children in the way which Kemal's character is afraid of.

---

[404] İbid, 81. The original text is as following: "aslında sağ kalıp batıda bir yerlere ulaşmak daha kötü. Bu kez adamların dilini kültürünü bilmiyorsun. Yolunu yordamını bilmiyorsun. İsyan etmiş eşkiyasın. Pis kürtsün. Kızılbaşsın. Bu nedenle hakaret görürsün. Insanda onur bırakmazlar. Onursuz bir yaşam düşünmektense ölmek yeğdir."

The exile experience of Hemedi in the novel, also passes under those conditions mentioned in the quotation below:he loses his wife there and he is forced to give his daughter, Helin, to an officer to foster. Because he does not want to lose her due to hunger like his wife, he constrains to give the child to Helin. The officer and his wife never show Helin to him again. After years, when Hemedi can see Helin alone outside, he goes to her and explains the 'truth':

> "My daughter, I am your real father. Your deceased mother used to love you very much. She died here while protecting you. A few streets forward from here. After your mother died, they took you from me. Look at me, my dear. We are Kurdish. Not Turkish. In Dersim, the Turks cut our ancestry." [405]

With the refusal of his daughter to leave with him the scene becomes very dramatic, and the idea that is implied throughout the novel becomes concrete. The 'occupant' state has become successful in the assimilation of Kurds, and because of the lack of 'unity,' which is repeated throughout the novel, the Kurds remain in that undesirable position. Therefore, as the closure scene of the novel, this meeting symbolizes the 'assimilation' whih, according to the novel, the state aimed and in a way became successful. Yet with the returning of Hemedi to the 'motherland Kurdistan', the novel indicates that despite the effort of the state, they called their region as 'Kurdistan' and themselves as 'Kurdish'.

Arevik: Dersim Tertelesinde Bir Ermeni Kızı[406]

The other novel of Haydar Işık analysed here is*Arevik Dersim Tertelesinde Bir Ermeni Kızı* (Arevik: An Armenian Girl in the Dersim Massacre). The novel *Dersimli Memik Ağa* focuses on Dersim 1937-1938. Yet, in Arevik the story timeline begins with the process before the

---

[405]İbid, 122. The original text is as following: "Kızım ben senin gerçek babanım. Rahmetli annen seni çok severdi. O seni korurken burada öldü. Bir kaç sokak ileride. Annen öldükten sonar seni benden aldılar. Bak kızım, kurban olduğum. Biz Kürdüz. Türk değiliz. Dersim'de Türkler soyumuzu kestiler."

[406] Işık, Haydar. 2013.*Arevik Dersim Tertelesinde Bir Ermeni Kızı*. Ankara: Satırarası.

1915 Armenian massacre. Like the previous novel *Dersimli Memik Ağa*the novel aims to show the 'evilness' of the state that manipulated the Kurds in killing the Armenians and the cruciality of the 'unity' of the Kurds in coping with that state,. The Armenian's fate, in other words, is described in this novel as the 'lesson' that the Kurdish people had to take at that time whiçh they did not, and at the end the state eradicated all of them[407]. The thesis of the novel, the grand narrative, therefore, recommends the Kurds to be a unit and fight against the state which eradicated their national/cultural existence. Therefore, the nationalist consciousness, is constructed here by self-orientalism, by the emphasis on the 'ignorance' of the Kurds, and the 'sacred' labor of the Armenians which the state eradicated with a genocidejust likedestroyed the honor of the 'Kurds'by assimilation and mass killing.. As a matter of fact, the omniscient narrator with his intrusive attitudes demonstrates all the evilness/goodness and describes the characters' physical appearances accordingly. The good characters such as Şakir Beg, Xıdır, Agop Agopyan, Arevik and İmam are described as handsome/beautiful/ solemn.The male characters are described as especially wise/merciful/fair. On the other hand, the evil characters like Mesut Bey, Temur Agha, are depicted as bad in coherence to their function in the story as the source of evil.

The novel begin with a scene in Dersim, Korta Boli just before 1915 which symbolizes the 'ancient' friendship between the Armenians and Kurds in Dersim.[408]The narrator focuses on two old Dersimis Agop Agopyan and Xıdır who are playing checkers.The dialogue between them shows that because of the news about democide of Armenians around Anatolia, Dersimi Armenians are in fear and tremblingthat their turn will come.

---

[407] The same emphasise can be also seen in the novel of Remzi *Aydın Toprak Dile Geldi*with a different discourse. According to the Aydın's novel, the Alevis betrayed Armenians and the Dersim massacre was the punishment of that fault. Işık's view is more modernist and nationalist but the theme is common. (Aydın, Remzi. 2011. *Xârdê u Korê Toprak Dile Geldi*. İstanbul: Kibele)

[408] The date is the spring of 1909 after the Armenian Massaacre in Adana was happened.

The narrator while showing the fear of the Armenian gives the deluge between the characters, he gives the 'ancient friendship' between two characters that represent Kurds and Armenians.[409] As a matter of fact, the narrator's attitudes towards the characters aim to give a certain impression on the reader about the characters and the connotations that they represent. The narrator describes Agop Agopyan's face as being 'out of harm's way'"[410] and Xıdır as a very merciful, good intended but naïve person. Agop Agopyan, as a wise, farsighted character represents the authorial point of view since the only personthat sees the future and the plans of the state is Agop Agopyan.[411] Also, he has a 'modern' perception of religion which describes religion as 'nonsense' and a manipulation instrument. On the other hand the nature, which is accepted as sacred by Alevis, is not problematized.

Beisdes that, the novel with the character Mesut Bey's perception of religion/belief proves the truthfulness of Agop's/ the authorial eye's perception of religion. Also, this perception actually fits the thesis of the novel, which imagines the unity of the Alevi and Sunni Kurds against the state and 'awareness' of all Kurds about the national consciousness without religious deference. In that context, Agop Agopyan is described in a 'purity frame' as a 'spiritual voice', which makes him the object of the narration in order to make the thesis clearer.

On the other hand, the narrator tries to show the influential existence of the Armenians in Dersim at that time to make the Ottoman/Turkish states' destructions clearer:

---

[409] Dersim is one of the ancient region which Armenians have lived and the Armenian culture has influenced the Dersim culture. Gürdal Aksoy, indicates that Dersim as the place of Armenians and Alevis, has percieved as a 'spotted' identity. Thus, in this novel, both Armenians and Kurds are described as the victim of the Ottoman/Turkish state tradition and the connection between this two peoples in this novel, is very coherent to the thesis of the novel. (Aksoy, Gürdal. 2012. *Dersim Alevilik, Ermenilik, Kürtlük*. İstanbul: Dipnot. Pg. 201)

[410] İbid, pg 9. The original text is as following: " Agop Agopyan'on kötülük uğramayan yüz hatlarına baktı".

[411] Haydar Işık, as a Kurdish activist, is the 'authority' who sees the future of Kurds, in case of not figting.

> When it was looked at, the Armenian laborers and master hands were making verandas, making use of every square meter, it saw the existence of a culture whose roots go very deep."[412]

The narrator states that Armenian and Kurdish culture existed in Dersim as an 'ancient existence' which is described as 'coherent to nature and a peaceful' life. The narrator, describes the year 1915 which represent the Armenian Massacre as the destruction of that peaceful, natural life. The information about the massacres around Anatolia, according to the narrator, ruined that life and brought fear and death. The novel, at that point, begins to blame the Kurds as being unaware and ignorant about the Ottoman/Turkish state's plan regarding Dersim. As a matter of fact, when Agop Agopyan as the 'wise' warns Xıdır about the coming future, Xıdır does not understand the 'seriousness' of the situation.

That conversation between Xıdır and Agop Agopyan, in other words, symbolizes two 'ancient' people of Dersim who are killed by the state one after another and the 'ignorance' of the Kurds, who could not understand the changing atmosphere of the world that puts the ethnic priority instead of the religion. According to the narrator, while Armenians were leaving their country, the Kurds were looking at them sadly but 'unaware of anything'. That certain thing that the novel implies is actually, the Kurdish nationalist consciousness. In other words, the novel imagines a community for the Kurds and indicates that identity is the 'right' way to survive against the tyrant state.

On the other hand, the novel by focusing on the Sunni-Muslim regions aims to show the 'propaganda' of the state against the Armenians to convince the local people to kill them. By showing that the novel both reveals the 'manipulation of the religion of the ignorance people' and 'confronts' the role of the Kurds in Armenian massacre. The novel implies that the Kurds are deceived/manipulated by the state:

---

[412]İbid, 10. The original text is as following: "Ermeni emeği ve usta ellerin taraçalar yaparak, her metre karesini değerlendirdiğine bakılınca, burada kökleri derine giden bir kültürün olduğu görülüyordu."

> "Well then, what kind of humanity is that where we are put on full alert against our neighbors? ... Why does the Sultan refer to that bad job to the Kurds? ... The Sultan wants to kill Armenians via our hands."[413]

The authorial eye which is *de facto* aware of the coming 'danger,' is informed about the future events and knows the better way for the Kurds, actually puts itself as a more 'modern' and looks at the events in that framework. Also, by indicating the manipulation of the Kurds by the state regarding the Armenian massacre the novel perceives the Kurds as a 'mass' without subjectivity or an alternative modernity which also corresponds to the same result. The novel, in other words, parallel to the previous novel, rewrites the arguments of the novels which imposes its modernism/civilization to the 'savage' and enlightens the 'ignorant'.

As a matter of fact, the other crucial character of the novel Şakir Bey is introduced as a powerful, brave, honest and 'grand' Kurdish Bey, who at first is not aware of the plans of the state but then understands the importance of unity against the state. On the other hand, Şakir Bey forms a binary opposition with the Turkish bey Mesut. As a matter of fact, Mesut bey as the opposite character representing the Ottoman/Turkish state is depicted as ugly, cruel, wild and unmerciful. As one of the applicators of the Armenian genocide Mesut Bey continuous to kill Alevis and Kurds. Yet, Şakir Bey although is 'manipulated' by the state, was not able to 'see the truth' and joins the Armenian genocide, soon 'enlightens' and becomes a Kurd who has a 'national consciousness'. As a matter of fact, one of female slaves of Mesut Bey, who is an Armenian women, wants Şakir Bey to rescue her from this 'cruel' Ottoman pasha's home.[414] That is also a symbolic rescue that represents victims of the cruel state, and

---

[413]İbid, 14. The original text is as following:"Peki bu nasıl insanlık ki komşumuza karşı teyakkuza geçceğiz. .... Sultan bu pis işi neden Kürde havale ediyor? ... Pasişah bizim elimizden ermeni kıracak."

[414] Temur Beg, is describes as 'infertile' and he has a 'harem' where he put women in and forced them to serve him. That Picture reminds the dicsourse on Kurds (specificaly leaders) who are described as 'polygamist', 'feudal' not respectful to the women. In other words, the novel, use the same words, discourses to cope with those arguments. The state discourse about the Kurdish issue, signs Kurds as 'uncivilized' which is used in this novel as a 'counter argument' over the Temur Beg character. (Yeğen, Mesut. 2006. Devlet Söyleminde Kürt Sorunu. İstanbul: İletişim. Pg 144-145.)

although the Kurds participated the massacre in 1915, they were not volunteers but were neither deceived nor too ignorant to see the 'reality'.

Before the Armenian Genocide, Şakir Bey visits Mesut Bey to talk about the general political atmosphere. Mesut Bey as a show wants two Kurdish men to fight with each other. The two men begin to fight and the powerful one suppresses the weak, and it seems that Mesut Bey is enjoying that situation. Şakir Bey, on the other hand, becomes disturbed from this scene, and criticises by saying that this is not humane. The explanation of Mesut Bey gives a foreshadow about Dersim 1937-1938 as following:

> "After resolving the Armenians, it will come the turn of those dung beetles."[415]

That symbolic scene implies the cruelty of the state in making the Kurds kill one another by both manipulating their beliefs and creating hostility among tribes. That indication both repeats the arguments of 'statist' novels and the 'unity' desire of the author. As a matter of fact while Xıdır does not approve the Armenian Genocide and rejects the offers of Mesut Bey, his son Temur, who becomes the leader of the tribe, cooperates with him for the money /statue, even though Agop Agopyan warns them that after the Armenians, they will be killed by the state. Also, although Şakir Bey does not accept the massacre by heart, according to the narrator, he feels forced to do so. In other words, on the contrary to Temur, Şakir Bey is depicted as wise/merciful but manipulated.

Agop Agopyan and his family leave the region and his servant and the daughter of his servant Arevik, remain there under the auspices of Xıdır. Because of the trauma of the Armenian

[415] İbid, 34. The original text is as following: "Ermeniler halledildikten sonar bu bok böceklerine sıra gelecek"

massacres Arevik does not speak any more.[416] Temur, as a Dersimi that cooperates with the state, also settles in Agop Agopyan house and marries Arevik.

After the 'cleansing of the Armenians' Mesut Bey says that the state will bring civilization to Dersim which was implied to be an eradication plan before. Şakir Bey, who is enlightened after the Armenian Massacre, tells his son Xalit that the state will kill the Kurds too. The words of Şakir Bey to Xalit can be seen as the authorial advice to the reader about what should be done against the state:

> "We were not able to look beyond, we were not able to be aware of the coming evilness, and we couldn't see the game of the state. Now, it is even a persecution to live in the land of our ancestor."[417]

The passage, repeats the manipulation of Kurds by the state during the Armenian Massacre. Regretting about the past, in that context, actually indicates the authorial view that aims to legitimize the position of the Kurds in the Armenian massacre. The "deceiving" discourse, in fact, neglects the subjectivity of the Kurds and completes the basic binary opposition and the thesis of the novel:The evil state against the pure Kurds. The lack of modernization/knowledge of the Kurds, therefore, puts the Kurds in such an undesirable position according to the novel. As a matter of fact, when Xalit mentions about the fear of the state about the power struggle, Şakir Bey again emphasizes the situation of the Kurds as following:

> "Xalit, they would want to attack you even you sit at your home, work on your field, and avoid meddling. They know about the disorganisation and weakness of us. While the world dressing the war's wound, what if they slaughter our people? ..... We don't have a

[416] In Haydar Işık's novel Gece Kelebeği, the protoganist also remains qouite a very long time after the Dersim massacre.

[417] İbid, pg.153. The original text is as following: "Biz ileriye bakamadık, gelecek kötülüğin farkına varamadık, devletin oyununu göremedik. Şimdi ata topraklarında bile rahat verilmiyor."

> cannon, we don't have a plan, and we don't have an army. In addition to that, because each beg does whatever he wants, which preparation did my son talk about? While I am unable to protect myself, how will I protect my people? Knowing what had been done to the Armenians, will be different what will be done to us?"[418]

The first emphasis of the text is that there is a pure evilness coming from the state. Because according to the text/the authorial eye, the Kurds are 'disorganized,' 'weak' the state has been manipulating them. Yet, the text has a solution for that which is in fact the Kurdish modernization. The only way reaching to this target isto battle against the state as a nation in a unity. Therefore, the 'cannon,' 'plains,' the army as the components of a modern nation states are the real necessity of the Kurds according to novel.[419]

Besides that, the religion is also evaluated in that modernization frame. For example, by the attitudes of Mesut Bey, who pretends to be a member of the religion with whom he is talking, the manipulation of religion is emphasized. In other words, the religion is not a source of power according to novel, and also the state manipulates the beliefs of the Kurds in order to destroy their unity and prevent them fromuprising against the state. The novel, in other words, recommends a 'modern' usage of religion which means putting the nationilty as the basic identity. The 'unity' discourse, in that context, is highlighted again. The words of Mesut Beg, shows the manipulation of religion by the state as following:

---

[418] İbid, pg.154-155. "Xalit, bunlar evinde otursan, tarlanda olsan, suya sabuna dokunmasan da üzerimize gelmek isterler. Dağınıklığımızı zayıflığımızı biliyorlar. Dünya harbin yarasını sanarken bunlar halkımızı katletmesinler? ... Topumuz yok, teyyaremiz yok ordumuz yok. Üstelik her bey kendi havasında olunca, oğlum hangi hazırlıktan bahseder? Biz kendimizi koruyamazken bu halkı nasıl koruyacağım? Ermenilere yapılanlar bilinirken, bize yapıalcak farklı mı olur?"

[419] Abbas Vali's points is very useful to understand that attitiude in the novel. According to Vali, the perception of Kurdsih modernization is very similar to Turkish modernization which is 'positivist' and 'pregressivist ' in the frame of economic welfare and technological progress. In the novel, the key of that modernization is implied as 'the unity of Kurds' and 'foundation of Kurdistan'. (Aydınkaya, Fırat. Abbas Vali ile Söyleşi: 'Kürt Aydınları Modernleşmeye Pozitivistçe Yaklaşıyor' *Dipnot. Sayı 1:* Nisan Mayıs Haziran 2010. Pg 43-59.)

> "Temur Beg, my brother, if he does not know, he should hear from me. Those words are said to dishonour Şakir. To Shafii Kurds. The Ahlulbayt Kurds are fairy descent." [420]

The Alevi and Sunni Kurds, according to the novel, are divided by provoking one another. When the Alevi people are not around Mesut Bey, he calls them as 'goblins' and here, Mesut Bey pretends to hear that humiliation from the Sunni Kurdish Bey Şakir. Therefore, a Turkish agha with rumours or superstitions, according to the novel, can deceive the Kurds. As a matter of fact, Temur Bey believes his explanation, and Mesut Bey continuous his 'evil' plans about the Kurds and Kurdistan under the name of civilization by emphasizing 'Alevism' of Mustafa Kemal. Therefore, it is obvious that the similar to the discourse of Bilbaşar and Baykara's novel, the 'manipulation of religion' disturbs the author of Arevik by a narrow margin which is the identity of the manipulator. While for Bilbaşar and Baykara it is the local powers, for Işık, the state is the real source of manipulation. Each case perceives people as objects.

As a matter of fact, the ignorance of the people is also a crucial theme in the novel which according to novel is the reason for the 'slavery'. The Kurds, according to the novel, who do not come together under the national unity, are manipulated and deceived by the state. The novel, in other words, by presenting the Armenian Genocide gives a background about the evilness of the state and criticizes both the 'comprador' characters such as Temur and the 'ignorant' people thatare not aware of the state plan on Kurds/Kurdistan. As a matter of fact, Temur, like Memik Ağa and the other leaders/persons that cooperated with the state, is killed by the state in the end. Also an Armenian Dersimi, Sarkis, who changes his religion in 1915 to become an Alevi, takes the name Hüsnü, according to the novel but still does not escape from the violence of the state. The Armenian Genocide, in other words is the 'real' face of the state, and according to the novel, the Kurds should take a lesson from that and organize their

[420] İbid, pg.200. The original text is as following: "Temur Beg kardeşim, bilmiyorsa benden duysun. Bu sözler Şakir namussuzunadır. Şafii Kürtleredir. Ehlibeyt aşıkı peri soyludur."

unity without looking at religion. That message, can be seen as a declaration for the all resistance/rebellions of the Kurds, including today's, which seems to be fragmented as Alevis/Sunnis etc.[421] As a matter of fact, one of the resisters of Dersim 1937-1938 İmam falls in love with Arevik and rescues her from the hand of 'comprador' Temur. Arevik begins to speak for the first time after 1915. That symbolic rescue implies that the Kurds and Armenians as the 'victims' of the same 'evilness'—the Turkish state.

Gülümse Ey Dersim 1-2-3

The discourse of *Dersimli Memik Ağa* and *Arevik*, which call for Kurdishness and reverses the arguments of the 'statist' novels, can also be seen in the three volume of Munzur Çem's novels *Gülümse Ey Dersim*.[422]

The last novel of the previous part, *Mustafa Kemal'in Kuşları Dersim Yanıyor*, introduces Nuri Dersimi (Baytar Nuri) as an English agent who deceived Seyit Rıza and by cooperating with 'external powers' provokes the 'Dersim rebellion'. The main thesis of the novel and the 'evil' of the novel, in other words, is based on an important historical figure of Nuri Dersimi. In the first volume of *Gülümse Ey Dersim* is confronted with Nuri Dersimi. Yet, the 'agent' Nuri Dersimi, appears here as a patriotic, intellectual hero that aims to emancipate the Kurdish people.

---

[421] Haydar Işık in his website, recomend Alevis to avoid the influence of Kemalist ideology and be with Kurdish movement. He add that, Alevi Zaza people are also Kurdish like as sunni Zazas and he claims that that stem from the attitude of the Turkish satate/Turkish left which has denyed the Kurdih identity for very long tim. Therefore, some Dersimis, according to Işık, become 'Alevici'(Alevist), 'Zazacı'(Zazaist), 'Dersimci' (Dersimist) in order avoid the Kurdishness. That, actually is coherent to the theisis of his novels either. (http://www.haydar-isik.com/content/view/16/51/ Access date: 18.04.2015)

[422] In this study the following issue will be used: Munzur Çem. 2013. *Gülümse Ey Dersim*. 3 cilt birarada. İstanbul: Deng.

The discourse of 'unity', the roles of the aghas, the religious difference which damages the 'unity' and the Kurdishness emphasize the main themes of this novel. It is possible to say that the common discourses of Memik Ağa and the novel of the previous part can be followed in this novel as well.

The novel begins with the portraiture of the Dersim in the eyes of Nuri Dersimi.[423] The omniscient narrator draws the position of Nuri in the thesis of the novel. The patriotic, intellectual character suffers from the position of 'his people' and works to save them from the 'state violence/assimilation'. The depiction of Nuri Dersimi in this context reminds the 'republican' characters of Baykara's novel who suffer from the 'persecution of the Dersimis' because of its social structure and the uncivilized life conditions. Yet, the responsibility of this suffering is totally put on sides opposite to each other. The same discourse, in other words, is used from the opposite sides. The 'hatred object' of Baykara's novel are the 'rebels', the anti-state 'savages' - the Dersimis, but in this novel, the 'hatred object' is the state itself that occupies Dersim and persecutes the Kurds from the very beginning of its foundation. The ignorance which is the common theme of the majority of the Dersim 1937-1938 oriented novel is taking place here as 'blindness'.

The omniscient narrator, as a matter of fact, by intrusive narration and by the minds of the protagonists conveys his message. The Dersimis are blind according to Nuri because they are not aware of the coming danger from the state and they continue to 'kill each other'. The target of the state is actually Kurdish people, which according to the novel can be understood from the Sheikh Said and Koçgiri events. The state, sooner or later, will kill and assimilate the remaining without looking at their religious sects or political approach. According to the

[423] Nuri Dersimi, who is accepted as a Kurdsih Alevi intelectual who struggle for the 'freedom of Kurdistan', Munzur Çem who is also a Kurdsih Alevi intelectual, in the first novel of Gülümse Ey Dersim, seems to convey his massage throughout Nuri Dersimis's character. Munzur Çem, has alot of works about Dersim culture, Alevism and Zazaki. Yet, similar to Işık's position, he is also believe that the state want to seperate the Kurds in to fragments in order to prevent their unity. (http://www.rizgari.com/ebook/Direnislerde_Kirmanc.pdf Access date: 19.04.2015)

novel, the Dersimis should have a 'higher aim' which is implied in the novel to be a foundation of Kurdistan, instead of killing each other, cooperating with the state and overcoming the sectarian differences.

At that point, the novel accepts the discourse in Baykara's and Bilbaşar novels, which indicates that the Dersimis killed each other and the intervention of the state would solve that 'wild' situation. Here, the narrator accepts the 'killing of one another's' argument but recommendes an opposite solution to it which actually can consolidate a 'Kurdish state'. In other words, the novel, as Chatterjee recommends in his doscourse, derives its arguments from the discourse of the 'oppressor' and reconstructs the 'public crime' discourse of the state and make it as a part of 'Kurdish nationalist' discourse.

As a matter of fact, Nuri Dersimi as a patriot intellectual, is always depicted as under the custody of the state that perceives him as a danger for the Republic. When Nuri Dersimi is invited to the general inspector's office to talk with İbrahim Tali, he observes the situation of the Kurdish people in the 'governmental' places. According to him, they are besieged by the state. As a 'Kurdish intellectual' Nuri Dersimi is also in there in order to be interrogated by the state. The narrator, depicts the atmosphere of this meeting as trustless because of the expectations of the sides from each other.

As a Turkish governor İbrahim Tali,[424] waits for the date that they will attack Dersim and 'discipline' it. On the other hand, Nuri Dersimi as a Kurdish activist/intellectual patriot, is aware of the 'plans' of the state towards Dersim. This awareness is introduced in the novel as a "weight on the shoulders" of Nuri Dersimi. Because, according to the novel, the situation of the Kurds is not only in a problematic stage in Dersim, but also the whole of 'Kurdistan' is in danger of basically being eradicated and assimilated. When Nuri Dersimi, Seyit Rıza and the other leaders of Dersim come together to talk about the plans of the state, Nuri Dersimi

[424] İbrahim Tali was the *Birinci Umum Müfettişi* (first general inspector) 1927-1933.

indicates that there is a 'Kurdistan issue' of the state, and Dersim is a part of that. In that point, similar to *Dersimli Memik Ağa* novel, the 'real face' of the state is revealed in the following speech of Nuri Dersimi:

> "In fact, we all know that the Ankara government does not accept the existence of a nation named Kurdistan. It openly denies our grand nation. I mean, we do not exist according to them, do you understand? We do not exist, our country does not exist. Neither as a nation, nor as a country. For example, the name of Kurdistan is not mentioned anymore in any official correspondences. In the period of the sultan, it existed, but now, it is not. In terms of the Kurdish issue, Mustafa Kemal falls even further behind the Ottoman Sultans. Look, there is not any Kurdish school around Kurdistan. ... I think this *umum müfettişliği* was found in order to annihilate the Kurds. ... With no reason, al lot of my family from different parts of Kurdistan were exiled, this is the first one. The prisons brim with Kurdish patriots more than ever, this is second one. .... The current government, belittles the Kurds more than ever, says that the Kurds are actually Turkish, this is the third one. Let us think, aghas, is this something ordinary?"[425]

This long speech of Nuri Dersimi, actually gives references to the previous novel's arguments and shows the perception of these arguments from the authorial point of view. The argument about 'Turkishness of the Dersimis,' which can be followed in the entire texts of the 'statist' novel, is objected and endeavored here to persuade the 'opposite' argument by emphasizing the Kurdishness of Dersim. Also, the region is mentioned as a separate country which is

---

[425]İbid, pg.14-15. The original text is as following:"Aslında hepimiz çok iyi biliyoruz ki Kürt diye bir ulusun varlığını kabul etmiyor Ankara hükümeti. O, koca ulusumuzu göz göre göre inkar ediyor ağalar. Yani onlara göre yokuz biz anlıyor musunuz? Biz yokuz, ülkemiz yok. Ne millet olarak varız ne ülke olarak. Mesela resmi yazışmalarda Kürt lafı geçmiyor artık. Padişah zamanında geçiyordu, ama artık geçmiyor. Kürtler konusunda Mustafa Kemal, osmanlı padişahından çok daha geride kalıyor ağalar. Bakın Kürdistanın hiçbir yerinde kürtçe okul yok. .... Ben diyorum ki bu umum müfettişliği Kürtleri ortadan kaldırmak için kuruldu. ... durup dururken kürdistanın başka başka yerlerinden bir çok aile sürgün edildi, bu bir. Cezaevleri herzamankinden çok Kürt yurtseverleriyle dolup taşıyor bu iki. .... Şimdi hükümet her zamankinden daha çok Kürtleri küçümsüyor, Kürtlerin aslında Türk olduklarını söylüyor bu da üç. Düşünelim bir ağalar, bu iş öyle sıradan bir şey midir?"

aimed to be occupied by the state. In addition to that, the argument that the 'Turkish Republic is better than the Ottoman state which persecuted the Dersimis for centuries' is reversed here. Mustafa Kemal, who is the 'rescuer' in all the other novels of Baykara and Bilbaşar, Yeşilova and Civelek, here is introduced as figure that aimed to eradicate and assimilate the Kurds. The attitudes of the first novel that indicate the Dersimis as Turkish, Kurdish as a Mountain Turkic language, which was spoiled over time and the depiction of the Turkish Republic as tolerant/equalitarian in terms of religious differences are all rewritten in this long quotation.

Also the implication of 'colonization' is highlighted by Nuri Dersimi's character. He defines the situation as living in his country as a slave, and it is exactly similar to what happens in the African, Asian colonies.[426]

The other influential character of the novel, on the other hand, repeats the same arguments, and also explains the 'colonization' goal of the state to the peasants. According to Alişer, the state aims to use the underground and above the ground sources of Kurdistan and to use the Kurds as slaves. The opening of the police stations and prisons are introduced as the evidence of that 'colonization' target. As another 'luminary' figure Alişer, informs the Dersimis. The narrator, emphasize the 'ignorance' of the peasants and conveys their thoughts as following:

> "They were poor people. They weren't educated. But it was not possible to sneeze at the things that Alişer Efendi said.In brief, he was a wise man, he knew too much, how great. According to the situation, Kör Mısto seemed to be a cruel sultan."[427]

The ignorance/poverty of the people, as it is seen in the passage, is the common emphasis of both the 'statist'and the 'opponent' novels. As a matter of fact, Alişer's recomands Dersimis

---

[426] İbid, pg.45. "Asya'nın büyük bir kesiminde Afrika' da yapılanlar farklı şeyler midir sanki? Hayır."

[427] İbid, 22. The original text is as following: "Yoksul insanlardı. Okumuşlukları yoktu. Akılları çoğu olaya ermiyordu. Ama bu Alişer Efendi'nin söyledikleri de yabana atılır şeyler değildi. Bilgili adamdı velhasıl, çok şeyi biliyordu maşallah. Duruma bakılırsa Kör Mısto zalim bir padişaha benziyordu."

putting the 'Kurdish national battle' prior to tribalism. Also, he emphasizes the cruciality of overcoming the religious sectional differences between Alevi and Sunni. Instead of that, Alişer advises putting Kurdishness as the priority. This discourse seems to be also a desire for 'modernization' which Turkish Republic has already done as the sovereign power. In other words, the authorial eye of the novels, both the first part and these parts have some similarities in terms of the ideological attitude, which can be pointed as 'nationalist' for foundation/sovereignty of different 'states'. As a matter of fact, the unity of the tribes/Alevi-Sunni Kurds becomes an influential leitmotif in this novel.

The omniscient narrator turns its focus on the 'Turkish governor's side in order to show the 'malevolence' of the Turkish governors and strengthen his thesis. According to Vali Fahri, the peasants of Dersim are "wild mountain monsters."[428] Also the language of the Dersimis is defined by "deli" (med) Fahri, whose idea is to eradicate the Kurds through a military operation, as a "weird" language. İbrahim Tali, who is the *Umum Müffetişi* (general inspector), on the other hand, accepts that the region belongs to the Kurds and recommends that the mission of the state sto be made on the Kurds that claim that they are Turkish. It is obvious here that the first idea seems to be barbarous and gives the massage that the real 'wild,' 'barbarian' party is the state not the Dersimis. The other idea, however, shows the 'real face' of the 'modernization' discourse of the state. Also, with the example of İbrahim Tali about the 'colonized' places the novel proves its arguments that the Turkish Republic's aim is to colonize Kurdistan and Dersim 1937-1938 is a part of this plan. [429] In addition to that, the novel gives references to the 'Turkish History Thesis' and 'The Sun language Theory' of the

[428] İbid, 29. The original text is as following: "vahşi dağ yaratıklarıdır onlar."

[429] İbid, pg. 59. The referred text is as following: "Öte yandan arkadaşlarım bir İngiliz ne kadar uğraşırsa uğraşsın Bir Afrika yerlisini, bir Hintliyi tam İngilizleştiremez. Ruhen yapsa bile bedenen yapamaz. Biri siyah ötekisi ise beyaz. Oysa misak-i milli sınırları içerisinde yaşayanlar öyle değil. Türkle Kürt, Laz, Çerkez, Arap arasında bir görünüş farkı yok. Bu bize kolaylık sağlıyor. Biz bunları Türk yapabiliriz. Böylece Anadolumuzda, homojen, yekvücut bir soy meydana gelmiş olur."

Turkish language that are also problematized here as to make clearer the 'real face' of the Turkish Republic.

Besides that, the killing of Bıra İvrahim (the son of Seyit Rıza) is told as an old revenge of Sıleman, who was shot in the past by Bıra İvrahim and then made peace with him by trusting the hostility of the state towards Seyit Rıza. Sıleman, the murderer of the Bıra İvrahim, according to the narrator, with the provocations of the state, kills him to take his revenge. The death of the son of Seyit Rıza which is told as a 'conspiracy' of the "British agent" Nuri Dersimi in the novel *Mustafa Kemal'in Kuşları Dersim Yanıyor*, shows a sign of 'enmity' between tribes and the intervention of the state to impel the Dersimis to kill each other. As a matter of fact the Kırgan tribe, who the murder of Bıra İvrahim is a member of, is attacked by Seyit Rıza. The narrator actually does not confirm that, and with this damages the 'unity' of the Dersim tribes/Kurds. When the peacekeeper Sey Usê comes to him to convince Seyit Rıza, placing emphasis on the current situation of Dersim, Seyit Rıza is forced to accept the peace in order not to harm the unity of Kurds. Therefore, Seyit Rıza as a Dersimi leader, is introduced and motivated here to establish 'unity' in Dersim against the Turkish state.

Besides that, the niece of Seyit Rıza and Rayver (Rehber) and his relationship with the state are also indicated to be 'comprador' acts in the novel, on the contrary to the novel *Tunceli 1938* that introduces him and Zeynel Top as 'sheepish,' 'diffident,' 'cowardly' and loyal to state. In this novel, Rehber makes a deal with the state and convinces Zeynel about the 'inevitable' defeat of the Dersimis. The narrator depicts the behavior of Rehber as 'insidious' and manipulative. As a matter of fact, Rehber convinces Zeynel about the solution to stop the war in Dersim. According to Rehber, the only way to stop the state's eradication of Dersim is by killing Alişer, who is known as the 'provoker' of the Dersim war. Therefore, Rehber as the real 'comprador' convinces Zeynel to kill Alişer. After a while, in order to stop the war as the government promised and Rehber guaranteed Zeynel kills Alişer and his wife Zarife.

Beside the death of Alişer and Zarife, Rehber, in order to improve his relations with the Turkish government that wants to take the son of Seyit Rıza whose leg is injured, convinces Resik Usên's mother and brings him to Elazığ hospital. Yet, the novel indicates that, the aim of the state is not to cure Resik Usên but to keep the under control. As a matter of fact, Resik Usên is executed with his father Seyit Rıza after going to Elazığ.

Şahan Ağa, who is described as one of the important leaders of Dersim 1937-1938 is also killed by his step-brother 'Pırçonun oğlu' (the son of Pırço) in order for him to take money from the government and satisfy his jealousy. Therefore, the fighter/resister who the 'state cannot beat' is killed by a Kurdish family member.

Lastly, Rehber, tells where Seyit Rıza is hiding to Binbaşı Kemal, who is the 'Turkish patriot' and 'republican' main character of both *Dersim 1937* and *Tunceli 1938* novels. The omniscient narrator during the operation of capturing Seyit Rıza focuses on Binbaşı Kemal's mind and as a subtext shows the 'racism' towards the Kurds. According to Binbaşı Kemal, the nations are not equal just like the people: some people do the 'higher' jobs and others serve them. Therefore, the death of a 'lower' nation member is not important. Also, Binbaşı Kemal thinks that he appreciates the Minister Esat Mahmut who has the following quotation:

> "The Turk is the only master of this country, the only owner of it. The people who are not from the Turkish race have only one right: The right of being a servant, the right of being slave."[430]

The implications of this 'betrayal' examples and these quotations that Binbaşı Kemal cites aim to underline the vitality of the 'unity of the Kurds' towards the 'racist' Turkish government. As a matter of fact, on the contrary to the expectations of Rehber that thinks

[430] İbid, pg.228. The original text is as following:"Türk bu ülkenin yegane efendisi, yegane sahibidir. Türk soyundan olnayanların bu memlekette bir tek hakları vardır: Hizmetçi olmak hakkı, köle olmak hakkı."

Kemal is a merciful person, Binbaşı Kemal kills the whole family of Seyit Rıza including his children. After that event, Seyit Rıza himself is arrested in the bridge of Elaziğ.

In the closure of the first issue of the *Gülümse Ey Dersim*, the narrator introduces Seyit Rıza as the leader of resistance towards the 'colonizer' Turkish Republic who is executed by them. His encourage during the execution, according to the narrator, shows the difference of the 'colonizer' and the 'oppressed nation's devoted members'. Therefore, with the closure, the narrator repeats his thesis and 'calls' the other members of the 'oppressed nation', in fact the Kurds, to resist against the state.

Gülümse Ey Dersim 2

The second issue of *Gülümse Ey Dersim*is basically about the Dersim 1938. Yet, the argument and main thesis of the first issue is continued here with the shadow of the plot. Especially, the fear, hunger, the battle between the state and Dersimi fighter and the sequel of the betrayers are the main themes of this issue. Also, the important figures of Dersim 1937-1938 appear such as Kopo Hüseyin, Qopo Usê and Zeynel Top. The novel has the same thesis that defines Dersim 1937-38 as a massacre of Dersimis done by the 'colonizer' state. Also, the leitmotif of the first issue 'the unity' is repeated here and with a camera eye of narration displaying the end of the 'compradors' to convince the reader in the necessity of the 'resistance' against the state.

Besides that, the rewriting of the opposite side's novel is also a crucial aim of this novel. As a matter of fact, the novel begins with the scene of a station under attack, in which Dursun Onbaşı dies. Dursun Onbaşı, was one of the 'evil characters' of *Memo* and one of 'heroes' in *Tunceli 38.* In this novel, Dursun Onbaşı is implied to be a 'racist' character who wants to kill all the Kurds and calls them 'savages.' When the station is besieged by the Dersimis, as a

matter of fact, Dursun Onbaşı prefers death instead of surrender. With this scene, the novel reaches two basic aims. Firstly, it shows the hatred towards Dersimis/Kurds. With that, the novel proves the racism of the Turkish Republic. Secondly, by giving a response of both the Dersimis and the commander to the death of Dursun Onbaşı, in which the Dersimis see hatred, and the commander sees a 'heroic' death of a person that prefers death instead of surrender to the 'brigandage' Dersimis, the omniscient narrator aims to convey the reader the 'right' way. As a matter of fact, the dialogue between the commanders about the plans of the state about the Dersimis/Kurds, strengthens the implication of 'racism' to the Turkish Republic as following:

> "In fact the success of Hitler is the victory of the nationalism against communism. Bravo to Hitler, at heart. I do not know this or that friend, I know two leaders on the earth. One of them is our Führer and the other is of German's. While Our Eternal Chief creates a nation out of nothing, Hitler reinforced his country and he became as capable to obstinate towards the world. Whatever, the important thing for us primarily is to clean the thorns of in front our feet.
>
> -At this time, I believe that we will be successful. I believe that, we will beleaguer the Laç Stream. If we can do that well, it means also that their end has come. I took an oath to not leave even a single person alive. We should do that to extirpate them. It should be like the scything."[431]

This dialogue contains 'pure evil' thoughts which are imagined to be the opposite of the 'pure goodness.' The commanders' admiration of Hitler represents an extreme racism, and

[431]İbid, pg. 349-350.The original text is as following: "Aslında Hitler'in başarısı komünizm karşısında milliyetçiliğin zaferdir. Alman milliyetçiliği parlak bir zafer elde etti. Bravo Hitler' e doğrusu. Onu bunu bilmem arkadaş, şu dünyada iki lider tanıyorum ben. Biri bizim Führerimiz, diğeri de Almanlarınki. Bizim edebi şefimiz yoktan bir millet var ederken, Hitler ülkesini güçlendirdi ve tüm dünyaya kafa tutuar hale geldi. Neyse bizim için önemli olan öncelikle ayağmızın önündeki dikenleri ortadan kaldırmaktır.

-bu kez başaracğımıza inanıyorum komutanım. İnanıyorum ki bir kaç gün içerisinde Laç Deresini kuşatmaya alacağız. Onu becerdik mi, onların da sonu gelmiş demektir. Tek bir fert bırakmamaya and içmişim. Öyle yapmalı ki köklerini kurutmalıyız haydutların. Tırpanla çayır biçer gibi olmalı."

compares him to Atatürk. This 'tribute' to the Kemalist commander is actually used here as critique. Also, the emphasis of creating a nation, as a subtext, confirms the thesis of the narrator that aims to show the 'real face' of Turkishness. Also, by this dialogue, the narrator reveals that the Dersim massacre is done consciously. In other words, the omniscient narrator, who is capable to see everything, takes the side of the 'rebels'. Therefore, the binary opposition becomes clearer, and the message/thesis of the novel finds a direct way to reach the reader.

Besides the binary oppositions, the 'correction' of the characters is also performed here. Qopo Usê, who is the 'republican' Dersimi character of Yeşilova's novel *Kopo,* is introduced here as a fighter who knows the 'real face' of the state, which according to him, accuses the Dersimis in any case. Therefore, Qopo Usê as an important resisters of Dersim, is shown here as one of the heroic Kurdistan patriots who aim to emancipate their country. In addition to a brief review of Qopo the novel focuses on Zeynel Top, who betrayed the Dersim resistance because of Rayver Top (Rehber). The narrator comments on his deathwith thefollowing quotation is significant in this context:

> "And Zeynel could not live, he died. He had been betrayed in 1937, but now he died with his gun, when he was resisting to the enemy."[432]

The military maneuvers, the oppression and the violence coming from the state, according to the narrator, enlightened Zeynel about the real face of the state. Therefore, from an 'ex betrayer' he becomes a 'brave' resister. It is obvious that in this way\ the narrator gives the same message to the 'other' Kurds who expect honesty from the state. Likewise, the 'essence' of character is defined as his ideological position.

[432]İbid, pg.377. The original text is as following: "Ve zeynel de yaşayamadı, öldü. 1937 yılında ihanet etmişti, 1938'de ise düşmana karşı direnerek elde silahla düştü."

Besides that, the Dersim 1938 events are depicted here as a massacre and the narrator shows it as a message to the Kurds, who do not have a "national consciousness." Therefore, the narratorshows the 'bloodbaths,' the killing of whole families including children, rapes, the suicide of women and babies thrown into streams not to be caught by the gendarmes. All these dramatic situations, in other words, besides 'being the voice of the oppressed voices' at the same time make the propaganda of 'Kurdish nationalism' which makes it similar of the literal position to its 'opposite' text.

The novel makes its closure to inform the reader of the ending of the 'compradors' such as the Kırgan tribe that is killed by the state. After the order of state to stop the 'massacre' the war seems to be over. Yet, the narrator implies that the exile, which is the next step, is the 'real' massacre that the state will practice there. As a matter of fact, the third volume of *Gülümse Ey Dersim* is about the exile process which the narrator implies has a resemblance to massacre and assimilation process.

Gülümse Ey Dersim 3

The third volume of the novel Gülümse Ey Dersim, both aims to describe the 'real face' of exile and the discourse of the state to legitimize of the Dersim massacre. In the beginning of the novel, the description of Hozat, in that context, is aimed to show 'occupied Kurdistan'. As a matter of fact, the narrator, tells the situation of Dersimis from the eyes of residents of Hozat as following:

> "As long as they gaze upon Dersimi capture groups consist of male-females off all sized, who were taken from the surrounding villages and mountains and always brought to the same point, the hurt that enclosed

> their hearts was becoming harder, their brain were narcotizing, and virtually they become unable to sense anything." [433]

The narrator, describes the exiled groups as captives/slaves that are being brought to the 'concentrating camps.' The narrator, on one hand, with the observation of the protagonist Memo shows the conditions of exile, and on the other hand, informs the reader about the 'reality' of the 'state propaganda'. According to the narrator, they give the order of stopping the 'massacre' but it comes to an end just at the time when the state wants to purify itself with the following:

> "Atatürk, İnönü and Mareşal Fevzi Çakmak do not know what happened here. They sent the military unit in order to maintain the order. The persons who killed so many people are some of the commanders in the region."[434]

The thesis of Bilbaşar's novel Memo is deconstructed by the narrator. The narrator perceives that as a 'purifying' pretext of the massacre. The author objects to the exisiting discourses and implies that they are 'propaganda.' In addition to that, according to the narrator, some Dersimi peasants who do not have the opportunity to know about political developments and are not in communication with the rest of the world, , believe in such propagandasdue to the happiness of surviving from the massacre. Also, in order to show the falsity of this propagandathe narrator adds that those 'unaware' Dersimis did not know that Celal Bayar and Fevzi Çakmak were in Dersim and observed all events that had happened in 1937-1938. Also, the 1937-38 massacre, according to novel, was the real/final aim of Mustafa Kemal and his government

---

[433] ibid, pg. 601. The original text is as following: "Gözleri etraf köylerde ve dağlarda ele geçirilen ve itile kakıla hep belli bir noktaya götürülen, büyüklü-küçüklü, kadınlı-erkekli dersimli esir gruplarına takıldıkça, yüreklerini saran acı büyüyüor, beyinleri uyuşuyor, adeta bir şey hissedemez oluyorlardı."

[434] İbid, pg.607. The original text is as following:"Atatürk, İnönu ve Mareşal Fevzi Çakmak'ın olan bitenden haberleri yok. Onlar askeri birlikleri sırf asayiş sağlansın diye göndermişler. O kadar insanı öldürten buradaki kimi komutanlardır."

about the Dersim. Lastly, the propaganda that claimed of Alevism of Mustafa Kemal, according to the narrator, still had believers in Dersim.

The narrator, in that context, accepted the 'ignorance' of 'certain' Dersimis that do not recognize 'their enemy'. In other words, the narrator tried to show that Dersim 1937-1938 had happened not only because of Alevism but also of Kurdishness. As a matter of fact, with the focus on the protagonist Memo the novel shows the 'real aim' of the state which is 'assimilation'. The humiliation of the 'Turkish' officers on their language/native names/physical appearances and forcing the Derismis to say 'I am Turkish' becomes the proof of the main aim of exile. The narrator indicates that as following:

> "From now on, it was the state who decided about if one can have a moustache and hair or not, if one can, the shapes of them were determined by the state." [435]

The size of intervention of the state is embodied by the narrator as the intervention to their bodies. According to the narrator, these attitudes continued in exile. When Memo and his family were sent to the region of the Aegean into exile, in addition to the state, the people of the region began to humiliate them. The narrator again tries to show their falsity of with them not knowing Turkish was seen as a sign of ignorance/shame. The other calls that Memo and his family hear in the exile are 'tailed Kurds' and 'Qızılbash,' which implies to be the state discourse. The narrator, in other words, emphasizes the cultural/ethnical differences between the Dersimis and the Turkish people, which also proves that 'Kurdistan' was occupied by the Turkish Republic. The novels in the previous part, on the other hand, generally evaluates such kind of calls as the ignorance of people, either by ones that do not know that all people are

[435] Ibid, pg. 631. The original text is as following: "Artık ve bıyık ve saçlarının olup olmayacağına, olacaksa bunun ne şekilde olması gerektiğini devlet tayin ediyordu."

Turkish in Turkey or by reactionist Sunnis who hates the Alevis. Also, those novels claim that both approaches are problems that Republic itself battles with. If the Dersimis believe the Republic, it will rescue/civilized them in every aspect. Yet, this novel objects to that argument and by depicting the discrimination as a state policy creates a derivative discourse from the first novels.

Besides that, the education system of the Turkish Republic is highly criticized in the novel. The schools serve to educate/discipline people to be Turkish. Also, during the children's educating process they also attempted to assimilate them. Especially because of not knowing Kurdish, the humiliation of children in the schools and the 'racism' behaviors that children face are emphasizesin novel very strongly as following:

> "Kurdish is not a separate language from Turkish, my brother. The thing that you define as Kurdish is a dialect of Turkish. It is the mountain Turkish. You will forget your accent and learn the Turkish language, which is the most clearer and supreme language of the world, ok?" [436]

The attitude of the state school towards the Kurdish language, as seen in the passage, becomes an example of the assimilation target of the state. The idea of 'superiority' Turkish, therefore, makes the state attitudes racist and gives the narrator an opportunity for anti-propaganda of the state policy not only regardingthe attitudes towards the Kurdish language, but also regarding the general approach of the state towards the Kurds including Dersimis. In other words, the narrator disposes to introduce Dersim as a part of 'Kurdistan/Kurds' and evaluates the Dersim massacre as the light of that 'presupposition' identity.

---

[436] İbid, pg. 733. The original text is as following: "Kürtçe Türkçe'den ayrı bir dil değil kardeşim. Kürtçe dedğin şey; Türkçe'nin bir lehçesidir. Dağ Türkçesidir o. ... O şivenizi unutup dünyanın en güzel en temiz ve en üstün dili olan Türkçe'yi öğreneceksiniz, oldu mu?

As a matter of fact, the closure of the novel, is made by Dersimis' return after twelve years of exile to their 'homeland' Dersim, which also implies a 'new born' battle towards the 'racist, occupant, and colonizer' Turkish state.

The three volumes of *Gülümse Ey Dersim*, therefore, seem to have a common thesis which evaluation of Dersim 1937-1938 as a massacre done by the Turkish government, Mustafa Kemal, Fevzi Çakmak etc. in order to eradicate/assimilate the Kurds. Aiming to construct that thesis, which corresponds with another nationalist discourse, the Kurdish one derives its discourse from previous 'state supporter' novels. .

Umudu ve Tutkusuyla Kopo

The last novel evaluated in this part is directly another version of Mustafa Yeşilova's Kopo, which also shows some the discursive resemblances with the "original" text of Kopo aimed to be deconstructed and falsified by *Umudu Ve Tutukusuyla Qopo*[437] written by Cafer Demir. The beginning of the writing of the name Qopo- Kopo, the novel objects to the character that is depicted in Mustafa Yeşilova's novel. From that perspective, it is possible to say that, Demir also as novels' of Munzur Çem and Haydar Işık derives his discourses from the 'statist' novel.

The novel begins with the 'narration' of Qopo of the cruelty of the state which according to him entraps and kill them. The discourse of Çem's and Işık's novels as an 'honorable death' is also an important emphasis of this novel. Qopo who is a leader and resister recommends Dersimis to resist against the state which kills them whether they resist or surrender. Therefore it is obvious that the character of Kopo Hüseyin in Yeşilova's novel Kopo and Qopo from this novel, although both seem to be the same historical figure, are depicted in opposite ideological position. The republican, Kemalist Kopo who is the victim of

[437] Demir, Cafer. 2005. *Umudu ve Tutkusuyla Kopo*. İstanbul: Umut.

the 'feudal' structure of Dersim, the reactionist Sunni people and some governmental faults, becomes a 'Kurdish nationalist' and a resister hero in the Cafer Demir's novel.

The novel, begins with the declaration of Qopo, who is introduced as one of the influential aghas of Dersim, of rejecting to surrender to the Turkish government. This declaration is supported by Qopo with some past 'bad experiences' of the manipulation by the government. Also, Qopo indicates that even if the state does not kill them, they will be sent into exile which means assimilation. Due to those thoughts with a group of people he begins to hide in the mountains. However, in order to survive in the mountain, he needs to have help of some people who are 'still' friends with him. The underlining of the 'betrayal' of the Dersimis to the 'Dersim resistance' occurres here too. Because of the 'compradors' and the Dersimi militias getting help in case of hunger becomes impossible. Also, when Qopo finds his 'remaining' friends, they help them, but the 'betrayer' Dersimis inform about them to the state, and they get killed by the state one by one. After a long time period where Qopo refuses to surrender he loses his 'valuable' friends due to their help to him. At the last stage, a woman Sultan recommends him to surrender to protect the people from violence and persecution by the state. Qopo, with the sense of guilt about his killed friends and the danger that he brings to villages he passes, decides to surrender. As a wise, heroic, honest person for the sake of his people, he goes to the district governorship of Pulur. Although he surrenders to the state, when the commander asks about another commander killed by the Dersimi resisters, he shows his 'side' to the commander about Dersim 1937-1938:

> "Colonel, the huge Dersim, is gone under the feet. It is levelled with the ground. Without looking like anything, every person was killed. After this all those disasters, you dare to ask who killed the commander." [438]

[438] İbid, pg. 191. The original text is as following: "Albay, koskoca Dersim ayaklar altında gitti. Taş üstünde taş kalmadı. Çoluk çocuk demeden onca insan öldürüldü. Sağ kalanlar ise sürgün edildi. Bunca felaketten sonar siz kalkmış yüzbaşıyı vuranı soruyorsunuz."

It is obvious that from the passage, the novel aims to prove that the surrender of Qopo did not happen because of his trust of the state. It happened because he did not want to cause of harm to any of the other villagers or friends who supportedhim. He indicates that the Dersim 1937-1938 as massacre and declares his side. Also, when Abdullah Alpdoğan wants to talk with him, he says that the state massacred them.[439]

Yet, the Kopo character of Yeşilova is depicted as surrendering voluntarily to be 'civilized' by Mustafa Kemal's 'superior' state. InYeşilova's novel, Kopo is not a resister, but a poor/ordinary Dersimi peasant who becomes the victim of the Dersim rebellion. He is on the mountains, but the only thing that he does is surendering himself without killing any soldiers. Although some government officers and some 'prejudice' people do not behave with him in a good way, he believes that Mustafa Kemal's Republic will bring a better life condition/equality/laicism. As a matter of fact, the reason for his surrender is to 'escape' from that wild place with his lover Elif and move into a 'civilized' place, raise/educate his children. Even the soldiers that love Kopo very much collect money for him to be able to settle in his 'new city'.

Therefore, obviously, this novel, reforms the Yeşilova's character and turns the character to his ideological position. The courage, talent and the honesty of the character is depicted as the character's essence in both novels, but this 'essence' becomes a Kemalist Dersimi peasant in Yeşilova's novel. Yet 'Kopo' turns to 'Qopo'—a Dersimi Kurdish resister in the Cafer Demir's novel who is very brave to dare to talk directly to the face of Abdullah Alpdoğan or other governors.

The exile process of the Kopo and Qopo are also different from each other. Kopo goes to Kayseri with his lover Elif, and his mother. Yet, Qopo has a family, children and the name of his wife is Fecire. Kopo takes support of the teacher of the village who represents the 'luminary' of the Republic. Also, the 'cruel' and 'discriminatory' characters are defined as 'bigot' Ottoman aghas and 'reactionists' who have not had the 'light of the Republic'. As a matter of fact, while the 'Republican' teacher defines him as the 'best villager among us' and supports him, the mukhtar and the other Sunni 'reactionist' people due to their 'ignorance','backwardness' and incapability to internalize the ideas of the Republic, behave very badly to Kopo and his family. It is obvious that, Yeşilova blames nonsecular ignorance of Ottomanist people for the persecution that Kopo experiences in exile. The Turkish

[439] ibid, pg. 202-203.

Republic and Mustafa Kemal, according to Yeşilova's novel, directly fight such kind of people who have not understood the 'idea' of the Republic.

Yet, in Demir's novel, on the other hand, from the momenthe is put in the 'black wagon' Qopo decides to go back to Dersim and resist the assimilation of state. Also during exile, the source of the persecution which he experiences is signed as a state. As a matter of fact, the supporter of Qopo, contrary to 'Kopo,' becomes an Armenian family that is exiled there during the Armenian massacres in 1915. After a while, his wife and his niece also say that they want to go back to Dersim because of the humiliation, having different cultures and feeling totally estranged there. The dramatic return of Kopo as it is obvious is not valid here. Qopo, goes back to Dersim, because, according to the narrator, it represents his culture/ /language, and it is his 'real country'.

The reasons of the turning back of both Kopo and Qopo actually show the narratives' intent. As it is evaluated in the first part, Yeşilova's Kopo represent a Republican, 'pure and poor peasant' who is 'potentially' a loyal citizen of the 'modern' Republic. On the other hand, Qopo is one of the 'honourable fighters, resister' local leaders of Dersim/ Kurdish people that 'does not bend the state's strength' and aims to 'emancipation the Kurdish people'. As a matter of fact, after finding shelter in the mountains for a while, according to Cafer Demir's novel, Qopo and his family are killed by the soldiers 'on purpose' instead of being captured. Yet, Kopo of Yeşilova, when he is surrounded by the soldiers introduces himself as a 'friend' of Abdullah Alpdoğan, and although the commander orders the soldiers to not shoot, he is killed by a group 'Seyithan.'. Therefore, according to Yeşilova's novel, Kopo died not 'on purpose' by the state, but accidentally because of the 'atmosphere' of war in Dersim.

As it is evaluated, the Qopo of Demir derives its discourse from Yeşilova's Kopo in order to prove its 'rightfulness,' but at the same time it reconstructs the claims of the target text by using its methods/arguments as the other novels in this part.

CHAPTER V:

Conclusion

The aim of this thesis is to present handling of the Dersim 1937-38 novels in the context of historiography on Dersim 1937-38 which was widely divided in two main discursive

constructions according to answer a specific question: "Was Dersim 1937-38 a massacre or a rebellion?" The answer for that question followed throughout the Republican novels: both in canonical and non-canonical novels. Although the answer is not as certain as the question itself, at beginning point, it gives an exclusive overview in terms of understanding Dersim 1937-38 narrations either in fictional or non-fictional areas. Following the traces of the answers of that question throughout the novels, the inter-textual relations between the narrations have been revealed in the theoretical framework of the binary opposition of "suppressed" and 'oppressed'. Having divided the main sources and the novels into two major parts, the relations/discrepancy/rewriting trials among inside of those major parts have been followed.

Dersim 1937-38, as a red line of the Turkish Republic's history, has been declerated as a liquidation of feudality or the basement of civilization in Dersim. This discourse was constructed via press, the official history and the novel which is a very useful mediator to convey a certain massage to the reader. The Republican intellectuals, therefore, have embraced the duty of conveying the official massage to the public via novels. Especially with the atmosphere of 1960s when the leftist ideologies were dominant in the republican intellectuals' ideological backgrounds, the class struggle, the education issue, the modernization problems gained a place in the Dersim 1937-38 events. Constructing a 'civilizer' mission for itself the state determined the content of the novels where the Kemalist view appeared sometimes with leftist and another time with more central approaches, but they has always been an extension of discourses of the novels especially those written between 1960s and 1990s. Kemal Bilbaşar and Mustafa Yeşilova wrote important examples of Kemalist/leftist Dersim 1937-38 narrations. The ideal characters of Bilbaşar and Yeşilova are both leftist and Kemalist: although it is not clearly decelerated it possible to follow the traces throughout the narration. Dersimis and the whole region are envisioned as an orient which

needs the help of the republican mind to survive. The protagonists, as a matter of fact, have always represented the ideal laic--Kemalist/leftist citizens of the Turkish republic. Interestingly enough, the Kemalism and left are depicted as the same ideology or Kemalism as an ideal form of leftist ideologies. The confusion of Kemalism and socialism in minds of that period's intellectuals, therefore, has appeared through social problems that they take into consideration. The Dersim 1937-38, according to them, was a crucial struggle of Anatolian villagers against feudalism. In fact, these themes take the inspiration from the historiography on Dersim 1937-38, which decelerate how it was necessary to civilize Dersim and eradicate the feudal leaders, who had persecuted people for a very long time. The role that state attributed itself, in other words, is reproduced in the fictional area and proceeded to be the dominated discourse on what happened in Dersim 1937-1938. Besides social realistic novelists like Bilbaşar and Yeşilova, in the same time period, Baykara, even not approving Bilbaşar's approach, gives the whole responsibility to "external powers"-- Britain and France-- in the context of Hatay issue just like the official historiography's approach. In other words, although the social realistic novelists at that time focused on 'feudalism', 'agha-villager' conflict and 'civilization/education' concepts, Baykara and Bilal Civelek, whose novels were published in very different time periods , emphasize the 'Kurdish/Alevi separatism', the intervention of 'external powers,' which create a more centralized/statist point of view compared the social realistic novels. Yet, it is obvious that, one way or another, all of these novels with these themes/approach legitimizing the massacre orientalise the Dersim and Dersimis and therefore, can be considered as a part of the official historiography on Dersim 1937-38.

On the other hand, with the 1990s, narrations of witnesses that were muted/hushed by the state uncover the secret of Dersim, which was in fact known by everybody but not talked. With the contribution of alternative historiography written at that time, those narrations of the

witnesses, turned in to novels which were written by Dersimi writer. The rise of Kurdish movement in 1990s also contributed to the novels that aimed to rewrite the novels, which ignore the massacre and challange the official history with the narrations of witnesses. Haydar Işık and Munzur Çem, wrote the first novels that described the Dersim 1937-38 as massacre, and against the official discourse they created a reverse narration of Dersim. Cafer Demir, as a good example of rewriting of a work, opposing *Kopo* wrote *Umudu ve Tutkusuyla Qopo,* which also based itself on witnesses and formed Qopo--an exactly reverse version of character Kopo. Constructing the arguments upon the 'statist' novel, those narrations also showed another layer of the effect of Dersim 1937-38 massacre on the language/culture of the 'oppressed', in this case, the Dersimis. In other word, the colonizer, with its acts influenced the language of the colonized people which caused their language to become a derivation of the colonizer. Dersimi writers, in other words, while correcting the wrongness of the discourses of those novels and the official history, inevitably used the 'oppressor's arguments-- the need of modernization, the ignorance of the Dersimis which can be considered as the examples of that 'derivation'. As a self-orientalist discourse, that writer's novel could not survive as the reverse 'copy' of the statist novel both in terms of themes and their literary values. Yet, this study shows me that, even those novels have some common literary values with statist novels because they are self-orientalist and modernist, they were the first narrations that declerated what happened in the Dersim in 1937-38.

With this study, on the other hand, I realized that the negative influence of the oppressor power leaves traces at least in discursive area. Dersim massacre, which is still perceived as a 'debatable' issue through the opposition of 'rebellion' and 'massacre', survived for a very long time, which is cultivated by both official history and, even if not willingly, by the Dersimis' writers works. In the context of confrontation, on the other hand, the Dersim narratives within the changing relations, conflicts and conciliations in both historiography and

fiction, had an opportunity to reveal the massacre experienced in 1937-38 in Dersim, which is also one of the results that this study reached besides the destructive effects of the 'colonizer' on the collective memory.

APPENDIX 1

Dersim 1937-38 Oriented Novels From 1960s to 2015.

1960-1970

1. Bilbaşar, Kemal. 1966. *Cemo.* İstanbul: Evren.
2. Bilbaşar, Kemal. 1967. *Memo.* İstanbul: Tekin
3. Bilbaşar, Kemal.1968. *Memo 2.* İstanbul: Tekin

1970-1980

4. Demirtaş Ceyhun. 1970.*Asya.*İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Kitapları.
5. Baykara, Barbaros. *Dersim 1937.* İstanbul: Akyar Yayınları, 1974
6. Baykara, Barbaros. *Tunceli 1938.* İstanbul: Akyar Yayınları, 1974
7. Yeşilova, Mustafa. 1976. *Kopo.* İstanbul: Milliyet (1976)

1980-1990

8. Arslan, Ali. *Serçe.* İstanbul: Sistem, 1988.
9. Işık, Haydar. *Dersimli Memik Ağa.* İstanbul; Belge Uluslar arası Yayıncılık, 1990.
10. Işık, Haydar. *Dersimli Memik Ağa.* İstanbul: Belge Uluslar arası Yayıncılık, 1990.
11. Çem, Munzur. 1990. *Gülümse Ey Dersim.*İstanbul: Deng
12. Çem, Munzur 1991. *Gülümse Ey Dersim.* İstanbul: Deng
13. Çem, Munzur. 1993. *Gülümse Ey Dersim.* İstanbul: Deng
14. Işık, Haydar. 1996. *Dersim Tertelesi.* İstanbul: Belge.
15. Oruçoğlu, Muzaffer. *Dersim.* İstanbul: Babek Yayınları, 1997

2000-2010

16. Aktaş, Metin.2002. *Sürgün.* İstanbul: Doz
17. Demir, Cafer. 2004. *Çıban.* İstanbul: Umut
18. Arslan, Ali. 2004. *Serçe 2.*İstanbul: Sistem
19. Işık, Haydar. 2006. *Son Sığınma.* İstanbul: Mezopotamya Yayınları
20. Demir, Cafer. 2007. *Sürgün.* İstanbul: Umut
21. Yıldız, Celal. *Dersim Dile Geldi.* İstanbul: Su Yayınları, 2008.

22. Kaygusuz, Sema.2009. *Yüzünde Bir Yer*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap
23. Canerik, Caner. 2009. *Gülazâre Bitmeyen Yolculuk*. İstanbul: El Yayınları

2010-2015

24. Demir, Cafer. 2010. *Umudu ve Tutkusuyla Kopo*. İstanbul: Umut
25. Işık, Haydar. *Mülteci Munzur*. İstanbul: Perî Yayınları, 2010
26. Karataş, Haydar. 2010. *Gece Kelebeği*. İstanbul: İletişim
27. Aydın, Remzi. 2010.*Sahipsiz Çığlıklar*. İstanbul: Kibele
28. Aydın, Remzi. 2011.*Toprak Dile Geldi*İstanbul: Kibele
29. Akbulut, Yılmaz. 2011. *Dersimin Dikeni* İstanbul: Cumartezleri Yayınları
30. Yiğit, Ali Bertal, 2011. *Çığlık*.İstanbul: Kardelen
31. Gerger, Adnan. 2012. *Bir Adı Cehennem*. İstanbul: Büyülüdağ Yayınları.
32. Civelek, Bilal. *Mustafa Kemal'in Kuşları: Dersim Yanıyor*. İstanbul: Yediveren Yayınları, 2012.
33. Baydar, Oya. *O muhteşem Hayatınız*. İstanbul: Can Yayınları, 2012.
34. Karataş, Haydar. *On İki Dağın Sırrı*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2012.
35. Işık, Haydar. *Arevik*. İstanbul: Dipnot, 2013.
36. İsmail Taylan Kaya.2015 *Vagon*. Dersim Yayınları

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arslan, Abdurrahman. 1991. *Samsun'dan Lozana Mustafa Kemal ve Kürtler 1919-1923.* İstanbul: Doz

Adıvar, Halide Edib. 2011. *Kalp Ağrısı.* Istanbul: Can Yayınları

-----.2010. *Zeyno'nun Oğlu.* Istanbul: Can Yayınları

Akar, Rıdvan ve Hülya Demir. *2014. İstanbul'un Son Sürgünleri.*İstanbul: Doğan Yayınları

Akbulut, Yılmaz. 2011. *Dersim'in Dikeni.* İstanbul: Cumartezleri.

Akpınar, Alişan ve Sezen Bilir, Serhat Bozkurt ve Namık Kemal Dinç. 2010. "II. Abdulhamid dönemi raporlarında 'Dersim Sorunu've Zihinsel Devamlılık." In *Herkesin Bildiği Sır: Dersim.* Ed. Şükrü Arslan. İstanbul: İleitşim.

Akpınar. Alişan 2001. *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Aşiret Mektepleri.* İstanbul: Aram.

Aksoy, Gürdal. 2012. *Dersim Alevilik, Ermenilik, Kürtlük.* İstanbul: Dipnot

Aktaş, Metin. 2002. *Sürgün.* İstanbul: Doz.

---2009. *Son Derviş.* İstanbul: Alternatif Düşünce.

Akyol, Mustafa. 2006. "The Origin of Turkey's Kurdish Question: An Outcome of the Breakdown of the Ottoman Ancient Regime" Unpublished Master's Thesis. (İstanbul: Boğaziçi University.

Akgül, Suat. 1992. *Yakın Tarihimizde Dersim İsyanları ve Gerçekler*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları.

Akgül, Suat. 1993. Cumhuriyet Dönemine Kadar Dersim Sorunu. *Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi OTAM*, *4*(04).

Akyürekli, Mahmut. *Dersim Kürt Tedibi*. İstanbul: Kitap yayınevi.

Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Immagined Communities*. London: Verso.

Aydın, Remzi. 2010. *Sahipsiz Çığlıklar*. İstanbul: Kibele.

-----2011. *Xârde u Korê Toprak Dile Geldi*. İstanbul: Kibele.

Aygün, Hüseyin. 2009. *Dersim 1938 ve Zorunlu İskân*. İstanbul: Dipnot.

Arslan, Şükrü. 2010. *Herkesin Bildiği Sır: Dersim*. İstanbul: İletişim

Arslan, Ali. 1988. *Serçe*.İstanbul : Sistem.

---- 2004. *Serçe 2*. İstanbul: Berfin.

Ayşe Hür "*Sene 1921: Koçgiri İsyanı, Alişer ve Zarife*". Radikal (10.03.2013)

Ateş, Kazım. "Turkish Nationality and the Ambiguous Status of the Alevi Citizen within the National Community". Turkish Year Book of Human Rights, Vol. 26-30, 2004-2008. Pg 61-85.

Aydın, Songül. "1938'de Dersim'den batı illerine Zorunlu Göç", Zeliha Hepkon, Songül Aydın ve Şükrü Aslan (ed). 2013. *Dersimi Parantezden çıkarmak*. İstanbul, İletişim

Aydın, Remzi. 2010. *Sahipsiz Çığlıklar Roé Dersim*. İstanbul: Kibele.

----.2011. *Xârdê u Korê Toprak Dile Geldi*. İstanbul: Kibele

Bağcı, Müberra. 2002. "Kemal Bilbaşar'in Hayati Ve Eserleri Üzerinde Bir İnceleme". Unpublished Master's Thesis. İzmir: Ege University.

Bali, Rıfat. N. 2008. *20 Kura Nafıa Askerleri*. İstanbul: Kitapevi

Baran, Taha. 2014. *1937-1938 Yılları Arasında Basında Dersim*. İstanbul: İletişim

Baydar, Oya. 2012. *O muhteşem Hayatınız*. İstanbul: Can.

Baykara, Barbaros. 1975. *Tunceli 38*. İstanbul: Akyar.

---1974. *Dersim 1937*. İstanbul: Akyar

---1974. *Şırzi Nefret Köprüsü*. İstanbul: Akyar

Belge, Murat, "Türkiye'de Sosyalizm Tarihinin Ana Çizgileri" *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce 8* (2007): 19-49.

Beşiki, İsmail. 1990. *Tunceli Kanunu (1935) ve Dersim Jenosidi*. İstanbul: Belge Yayınları.

--- 1977. *Bilim Yöntemi Türkiye'deki Uygulama 1, Kürtlerin 'Mecburi İskan'ı*. İstanbul: Komal.

Bilbaşar, Kemal. 1971. *Cemo*. İstanbul: Tekin

--- 1969-1970. *Memo* cilt 1-2. İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi.

----1935. *Medeniyetin Doğuş ve Yayılışında Türklerin Rolleri*. İstanbul: Burhaneddin Matbaası.

Bülent Bilmez. 2012 "Sözlü Tarih ve Belgesel Film Aracılığıyla Bir Kıyımla Yüzleşmek ve Hesaplaşmak" Özgür Fındık.*Kara Vagon*. İstanbul:Fam

Bora, Tanıl. "1930'lardan 1950'lere Resmi Milliyetçiliğin Dersim'e Bakışı: Asimilasyonizmin Kırılganlığı." in Zeliha Hepkon, Songül Aydın and Şükrü Aslan. 2013. *Dersim'i Parantezden Çıkarmak*. İstanbul: İletişim. Pg 77-96

Bozarslan, Hamit. 2003. "Alevism and the Myths of Research: the need for a new Research Agenda" Pg 3-15 in White, Paul Joseph, and Joost Jongerden, eds. *Turkey's Alevi Enigma: A Comprehensive Overview*. Vol. 88. Brill.

---2008. *Türkiyenin Modern Tarihi*. Çev. Heval Bucak İstanbul: Avesta

---2003. "Kurdish Nationalism in Turkey: From Tacit Contrat to Rebellion (1919-1925)," in Essays on the Origins of Kurdish Nationalism ed. Abbas Vali .Costa Mesa, California: Mazda 2003

--- 2005. "Türkiye'de (1919-1980) Yazılı Kürt Tarih Söylemi Üzerine Bazı Hususlar." *İn Kürt Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri.*Ed. Abbas Vali. İstanbul: Avesta.

Brunessen, Martin Van. 2000. *Kürtlük Türklük Alevilik*. Çev. Hakan Yurdakul. İstanbul İletişim.

--- 2003. *Ağa Şeyh ve Devlet.* Çev. Banu Kalkan. İstanbul: İletişim.

Bulut, Faik. 2005. *Dersim Raporları*. İstanbul: Evrensel.

Canerik, Caner. 2011. *Gülüzâre Bitmeyen Yolculuk*. İstanbul: El.

Carlson, Marie, Annika Rabo and Fatma Gök. "Education in 'Multicultural' Societies – Turkish and Swedish Perspectives",eds. Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, Transactions, vol. 18 (Stockholm 2007), pp. 93-105

Cengiz, Seyfi. 1995. *Dersim ve Dersimli.* İstanbul:Desmala Sure.

Chatterjee, Partha. 1986. *Nationalist thought and the colonial world: A derivative discourse*. London: Zed Books.

Civelek, Bilal. 2012. *Mustafa Kemal'in Kuşları Dersim Yanıyor.* İstanbul: Yediveren.

Çağaptay, Soner. 2009. *Türkiye'de İslam, Laiklik ve Milliyetçilik: Türk Kimdir?* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

---. 2007. "Türklüğe Geçiş: Modern Türkiye'de Göç ve Din", Haldun Gülalp (ed).*Vatandaşlık ve Etnik Çatışma*, İstanbul: Metis

Çamuroğlu, Reha. 1998.'Resmi İdeoloji ve Aleviler' in *Birikim* 105-06: 1142-18.

Çem, Munzur. 2013. *Gülümse Ey Dersim*. 3 cilt birarada. İstanbul: Deng

Çiya, Sait. 1998. *Dersim Yazıları*. İstanbul: Tij

Danık, Ertuğrul. "Dersim'in Siyasi Tarihi Çalışmaları ve Siyasal Görüşler." in *Kebikeç*. Sayı 6, 1998.

Demir, Cafer. 2005. *Umudu ve Tutkusuyla Qopo*. İstanbul: Umut.

---2004. *Çıban*. İstanbul: Umut.

---2006. *Sürgün*. İstanbul: Umut.

Demir, Fethi. 2014. "Karşıt Tezleri Savunan Romanlar Bağlamında Dersim 1938 Olayları" in *Turkish Studies*. Volume 9/12, Fall 2014, pg. 149-160.

---2014. "Sema Kaygusuz'dan Dersim Trajedisine Dair Modern Bir Roman: Yüzünde Bir Yer" in *Journal of International Social Research*, 7(29).

Demirtaş Ceyhun. 1970. *Asya*. İstanbul: OK.

Deringil, Selim. 1998. *Well Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876-1909*. London: IB Tauris.

---2007. *Simgeden Millete*.İstanbul:İletişim.

Derrida, Jacques. 1998. *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Dersimi, Nuri. 1994. *Kürdistan Tarihinde Dersim*. İstanbul: Zel.

---1997. *Hatıratım. İstanbul: Doz.*

Fındık, Özgür.2012. *Kara Vagon*. İstanbul: Fam

Foucault, Michel, 2010. *The Birth Of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France 1978-1979*. New York: Palgrave Macmillian.

--- 2011. *Özne ve İktidar*. Çev. Işık Ergüder ve Osman Akınhay. İstanbul: Ayrıntı.

Gökalp, Ziya. 1973. Türkçülüğün Esasları İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.

Gündoğdu, Cihangir ve Vural Genç. 2013. *Dersim'de Osmanlı Siyaseti*. İstanbul: Kitapyayınevi.

Gündoğdu, Nezahat ve Kazım Gündoğdu. 2012. *Dersim'in Kayıp Kızlar*. İstanbul: İletişim

Gürboğa, Nurşen. 2011. "Erken Cumhuriyet Döneminde Devletin Dersim'le İmtihanı" *Toplumsal Tarih,* sayı 212, Ağustos 2011.

Hallı, Reşat. 1972. *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Ayaklanmalar*. Ankara: Genelkurmay Basımevi.

Hepkon, Zeliha, Songül Aydın and Şükrü Aslan. 2013. *Dersim'i Parantezden Çıkarmak*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Hobsbowm, E.J. 1972. *Bandits*. Pelican Books

Hutchehon, Linda. 1990. *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*. New York and London: Routledge

Işık, Haydar. 1990. *Dersimli Memik Ağa*. İstanbul: Belge uluslararası Yayıncılık.

---. 2006. *Son Sığınma*. İstanbul: Mezopotamya.

---1996. *Dersim Tertelesi*. İstanbul: Belge.

---2013. *Arevik Dersim Tertelesinde Bir Ermeni Kızı*. Ankara: Satırarası.

İnsel, Ahmet, "Giriş", *Kemalizm: Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce, Cilt 2*, (ed.) Ahmet İnsel, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, 2001, s. 13-27.

Kahraman, Ahmet 2003. *Kürt İsyanları Tedip ve Tenkil*. İstanbul: Evrensel.

Karaca, Ali. 1993. *Anadolu Islahatı ve Ahmed Şakir Paşa. (1838-1899)* İstanbul: Eren.

Karakas, Cemal. (2007). "Turkey: Islam und Laicism between the interests of state, politics, and society." PRIF Reports No. 78.

Karakurt, Esat Mahmut. 1934. *Dağları Bekleyen Kız*. İstanbul İnklap

Karataş, Haydar. 2012. *On iki Dağın Sırrı*. İstanbul: İletişim.

---. 2010. *Gece Kelebeği Perperik-a Soe*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Kaya, İsmail Taylan. 2015. *Vagon*. İstanbul: Dersim Yayınları

Kaya, Mehmet S. 2011. *The Zaza Kurds of Turkey*. London; New York: Tauris.

Kaygusuz, Sema. 2009. *Yüzünde Bir Yer*. İstanbul: Doğan.

Küçük, Murat. "Türkiye'de Sol Düşünce ve Aleviler" *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce Cilt 8: Sol* (2007):896-935.

Kieser, Hans-Lukas, 2011. "Dersim Massacre 1937-1938", *Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence*, URL: http://www.massviolence.org/Dersim-Massacre-1937-1938, ISSN 1961-9898.

Kodal, Tahir. "Mustafa Kemal Atatürk ve Türk Ocakları" in A.Ü. Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi [TAED] 52, Erzurum, 2014. Pg 295-314.

Koç, Nurgün." Şeyh Sait Ayaklanması" in *Turkish Studies*. Volume 8/2, Winter 2013, Ankara, p153-156.

Koç, Yener.2012. "Bedirxan Pashazades Power Relations and Nationalism (1876-1914)" Unpublished Master's Thesis. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Unversity.

Korucu, Serdar ve Aris Nalcı. 2014. *1965 /2015'ten 50 yıl önce, 1915'ten 50 yıl sonra.* İstanbul: Ermeni Kültür Yayınları.

Lewis, Bernard. 1968. *The Emergance of Modern Turkey*. London: Oxford University Press,

Makdisi, Ussama. 2002. Ottoman orientalism. *The American Historical Review*, *107*(3), 768-796.

--- 2000. *The culture of sectarianism: community, history, and violence in nineteenth-century Ottoman Lebanon*. Univ of California Press.

Massicard, Elise. "The Repression of the Koçgiri Rebellion 1920-1921". *Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence*. http://www.massviolence.org/The-Repression-of-the-Kocgiri-Rebellion-1920-1921 (17.01.2015).

McDowall, David. 2003. *Modern History of the Kurds*. IB Tauris,

Moran, Berna. 2009. *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış*. İstanbul: İletişim

Mumcu, Uğur. 2004. *Kürt Dosyası*. 30. baskı Ankara: Umug

Olson, Robert. 2000. "The Kurdish rebellions of Sheikh Said (1925), Mt. Ararat (1930), and Dersim (1937-8): Their impact on the development of the Turkish Air Force and on Kurdish and Turkish nationalism". *Welt des Islams*, *40*(1), 67-94.

Oran, Baskın. *2010*. "Azınlıklar", *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi, İstanbul: NTV Yayınları.*

---2009. "Kürt Milliyetçiliğinin Diyaleği" *in* Ed. Tanıl Bora. *Milliyetçilik:Modern Türkiye'de siyasi düşünceler*. p 871-880. İstanbul: iletişim.

Oruçoğlu, Muzaffer. 1997. *Dersim*. İstanbul: Babek.

Orhan, Mehmet. 2012. "Kurdish Rebellions and Conflict Groups in Turkey during the 1920s and 1930s" in *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* Vol. 32, No. 3, September 339–358.

Öz, Baki. 1999. *Belgelerle Koçgiri Olayı.* İstanbul: Can.

Özgen, Neşe. 2012. "Haydar Karataş'ın Romanlarında Dersim'in Kültürel BelleğininYeniden Kurgusu" in *Notos Öykü.* 36.

Öztürk, Saygı. 2008. *İsmet Paşa'nın Kürt Raporu*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap

Parla, Jale. 2008. Babalar ve Oğullar. İstanbul: İletişim

Poyraz, Bedriye. (2013). "Cesaret et hatırla!": Dersim 1938 Tertelesi.in*Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 68(03), 063-093.

Said, Edward. 1979. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.

Schick, İrvin Cemil. 2000. *Batı'nın Cİnsel Kıyısı*. Çev. Savaş Kılıç ve Gamze Sarı. İstanbul: Tarihi Vakfı Yurt Yayınları

Soileau, Dilek. "Koçgiri ve Dersim Kürt hareketliliği: Koçgirili Alişer Efendi ve Nuri Dersimi'nin rolüne dair" 335-356 in der. Şükrü Arslan. 2011. *Herkesin Bildiği Sır: Dersim*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Somay, Bülent" Türkiye Solunun Kemalizmle İmtihanı"." *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce Cilt 8: Sol* (2007): 647-661.

Somel, Selçuk Akşin. *Modern Muslim Education in İstanbul During the Tanzimat Era.* URL:http://research.sabanciuniv.edu/21970/1/Muslim_Education_inIstanbul_during_the_Tanzimat_Era_Somel.pdf

Toprak, Zafer. "Sunuş" in *Dersim Harekatı ve Cumhuriyet Bürokrasisi* (1936-190). Ed. Tuba Ekmekçi ve Muazzez Pervan. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
Tosh, John. 2013. *Tarihin Peşinde*. Çev. Özden Arıkan. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

Türkeş, A. Ömer. "Milli Edebiyat'tan Milliyetçi Romanlara" *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce Cilt4: Milliyetçilik (2009):* 811-829.
Uluğ, Neşit Hakkı. 2011. *Derebeyi ve Dersim*. İstanbul: Kaynak

---. 1939. *Tunceli Medeniyete Açılıyor*. İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Matbaası
Türkyılmaz, Zeynep. 2001. Nationalizing Through Education: The Case Of "Mountain Flowers" At Elazig Girls' Institute.Unpublished MA Thesis İstanbul: Boğaziçi University.

Uran, Hilmi. 1944. "Bazı Şark Vilayetlerimizde tatbiki lüzumlu temsil tedbirleri hakkında rapordur" (9 Kânunuevvel 1944) Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Cumhuriyet Arşivi.

Urgan, Mine. 1999. *Bir Dinozor'un Gezileri.* İstanbul: YKY

Vali, Abbas. 2005. Kürt Milliyetçiliğinin Kökenleri. Çev. Fahriye Adasoy, Ümit Aydoğmuş, Sema Kılınç. İstanbul: Avesta.

Veroz, Düzgün. "Seyit Rıza'nın Oğlu Baba İbrahim'in Öldürülmesi." Radikal (06.12.2013) http://blog.radikal.com.tr/yasam/seyit-rizanin-oglu-baba-ibrahimin-oldurulmesi-41805.

Yeşilova, Mustafa. 1978. *Kopo.* İstanbul: Milliyet.

Yeğen, Mesut .2001. "Kemalizm ve Hegemonya?" in *Kemalizm: Modern Türkiye'de Siyasal Düşünce*, Cilt 2, (ed.) Ahmet İnsel, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, , pg 56-75.

---. 2008. "Türk Milliyetçiliği ve Kürt Sorunu" in *Milliyetçilik: Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce. Ed. Tanıl Bora.* İstanbul: İletişim. Pg. 880-893.

---. 1999. *Devlet Söyleminde Kürt Sorunu.* İstanbul: İletişim

Yeğeneoğlu, Melda.2003. Sömrügeci Fanteziler: *Oryantalist Söylemde Kültürel ve Cinsel Fark.* İstanbul: Metis.

Yılmazçelik, İbrahim. 2010. *Dersim Sancağının Kırılmasından Sonra Karşılaşılan Güçlükler ve Dersim Sancağı ile İlgili Bu Dönemde Yazılan Raporlar (1875-1918) OTAM*(Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi)Sayı: 28 Sayfa: 163-214.

Yıldırım, Tuğba. 2011. *Kürt Sorunu ve Devlet: Tedip ve Tenkil Politikaları.* İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları. Pg 97-103. The Fon Code of the document: NSS, Seri No: 03, Dosya No: 22, Belge No: 200.

Yıldız, Celal. 2003. *Dersim Dile Geldi.* İstabul: Tij

Yücel, Müslüm. 2011. *Osmanlı Türk Romanında Kürt İmgesi.* İstanbul: Agora.

Yüksel, Murat. 2010."Ulus Devletin Dersimle Teması" pg 357-371 in Ed. Şükrü Arslan *Herkesin Bildiği Sır Dersim.* İstanbul: İletişim.

Zelyurt, Rıza. Dersim İsyanları ve Seyit Rıza. Ankara: Kripto, 2011.

Zeydanlıoğlu, Welat. 2009. "Beyaz Türk'ün Yükü": Oryantalizm, Kemalizm ve Türkiye'de Kürtler *Toplum ve Kuram*, Sayı:2: 195-211.

Zeyrek, Suat. "Milli Mücadele Sürecinde Türk-İngiliz Rekabeti: Kürt Sorunu" in *Türkiyat Mecmuası,* C. 23/Bahar, 2013.

Zeytinli, Murat. 2012. "Zorunlu Göçler ve Türkiye'de Dersim 1938 Örneği" Unpublished Dissertation. İstanbul: İstanbul Universty.

Zürcher, Eric Jan. 2005.*Savaş, Devrim ve Ulusallaşma.* İstanbul: İstanbul bilgi üniversitesi yayınları,.

--2009. "Kemalist Düşüncenin Osmanlı Kaynakları" in *Kemalizm: Modern Türkiyede Siyasi Düşünceler*, Ed. Ahmet İnsel. İstanbul: İletişim pg 44-56.

---1998. *Turkey: A Modern History*. London: I.B. Tauris

Zorlu, Melek. 2006. "Tkp'den Tip'e Sol Kemalizm: Mdd Örneği" Unpublished Master's Thesis. Ankara: Ankara University.

Unknown writer. 1992. *Koçgiri Halk Hareketi*. İstanbul: Komal.

"Kemal Bilbaşar ile Konuşma", *Yeni Ortam*, 11 Kasım 1972.

ELECTRONIC SOURCES

http://www.haydar-isik.com/indx.php?option=content&task=view&id=133

http://www.belgeyayinlari.com/page.php?id=2

http://www.haydar-isik.com/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=133

http://www.belgeyayinlari.com/page.php?id=2

http://dersimnews.com/manset/munzur-cemin-katil-yavuz-selim-hayranligi.html

http://www.muzafferorucoglu.com/articles-detail.php?lng=tr&cid=138

http://www.bianet.org/biamag/kultur/119750-saidi-kurdi-nin-romani-son-dervis

http://arsiv.taraf.com.tr/haber-yazdir-43980.html

http://www.radikal.com.tr/ek_haber.php?ek=ktp&haberno=1970

(http://www.milligazete.com.tr/haber/Mustafa_Kemal_Dersimde_vurulmus/265839#.VTTO0ZN8vKg

http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/dersim_katliaminda_kimyasal_izi_ilk_kez_ortaya_cikti-1164486.